

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 2.

MAY, 1890.

No. 2.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

OUR GOVERNMENT AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY M. VALENTINE, D.D., LL.D., PRESIDENT OF THE LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
GETTYSBURG, PA.

QUITE lately in Washington City a little convention of infidel women, as a self-constituted authority, declared, in a series of turgid resolutions, the utter illegitimacy of all connection, theoretical or practical, of our Government with Christianity, and demanded its exclusion from all official recognition, especially from our public education. They have entered suit for a complete divorce, in the supposed interest of impartiality, as thought to be required by the presence of Jews, heathen, agnostics, atheists, and infidels of all sorts among us. In this interest they claim that Government itself shall be agnostic of the whole religious idea. This convention was, indeed, a small affair, both as to numbers and moral weight, and its resolves might easily be allowed to pass without notice. This notice of it is, in fact, not meant to assign it any other importance than that which belongs to a straw which reminds of the direction of a current. There is also in our country an organized "Liberal League" that, for years, has been loudly denying that we of right are a Christian nation, and keeping up a bitter warfare against all such practices of our National and State Governments, as show any alliance with Christian ideas and principles. In their pronouncements, frequently rehearsed in the hearing of the whole country, they have a long series of "We-demands," the sum of which is that our civil polity, from the highest to the lowest places of the Government, shall be administered on a purely secular basis, recognizing no God, nor any respect to His authority as Supreme Ruler of men and nations, abrogating all laws that protect the Christian Sabbath, or look to the teaching and enforcement of "Christian" morality in any way. In short, they demand that Christianity, whether viewed as a religious or ethical faith, shall be entirely and unflinchingly eliminated from our political theory and practice, and our civil system be

reduced to the Nihilistic secularism of atheism. But this "League" also embraces and stands for only a very little fraction of our citizenship, and attracts attention mostly by the phenomenal extremeness of its demands and the audacity with which it insults both the religious and moral sense of the land. The source and intemperateness of the assault annuls its power for injury. In itself, though helped by all the vociferous socialists that have come to us from foreign shores, it would be able to do but little to overthrow our Christian order and institutions.

And yet in connection with the aims and demands of these enemies of Christianity there has come for our country one of the great issues of our times. For within the Church itself, and among the most sincere and consecrated friends of Christ, has appeared a species of secularism in strange and unnatural alliance with the theories and purposes of these few enemies of Christianity. From pulpit and platform, through review and magazine and newspaper, are set forth teachings which, in disconnecting government from relations to the Church, so disconnect it also from its relations to God and Christian morality, as to prove, if allowed to prevail, fully efficient for the ends for which agnostics and infidels would otherwise labor in vain. They are preparing the way for a complete separation of the political thought, life, and methods from the wholesome restraints and guidance of Christian principles and considerations, and for a surrender of all questions of civil law or governmental polity to popular decisions in which no reference shall be had to divine authority or law. They tend to make Christian citizenship divest itself of Christian views and conscience at the polls, and vote for men and measures without regard to the demands of God's eternal sovereignty and laws. The way is thus opened to the fullest working of political demagogery, and the increasing ascendancy of political counsels which threat-

en a surrender of one after another of the Christian features of our institutions, and take away the barriers necessary to keep liberty from degenerating into license. We cannot but regard these teachings, however well meant, as utterly false to Christianity and wanting in political wisdom. The alliance between these friends of Christianity and its enemies in advocating an abandonment of Christian recognitions in civil authority and administration, is truly unnatural. It is in the highest degree unfortunate—not mainly, however, for the sake of Christianity. Christianity can do its work without any special help from the Government. It has often lived and wrought without the smiles of the civil power and even through fires of Governmental persecution. But it is to be deplored for the country's sake. This cause is not to be pleaded as if the power of Christianity, or of the Church even, were at stake, or were dependent on peculiar favor of the civil authority. Without doubt, indeed, the absolute divorce sought would bring conditions less favorable for its purely spiritual work. But it mainly concerns the right order and best interests of the people within that temporal sphere over which civil government itself presides.

A correct view of the whole subject can be reached only by keeping in mind some fundamental principles involved. The entire question must be looked at from the *Christian standpoint*—unless, indeed, we are ready to place the divine authority of Christianity among open questions, with no more right to be held as expressing the true view of the world and human life than atheism or any of the heathenisms that may have representatives among us. The contention is not with those who seek the exclusion of all religion on agnostic or infidel grounds, but with those who, while recognizing the everlasting and irrevocable truth of Christianity and its theistic view of the world, yet fail to estimate the duties of citizenship in this light. The true conclusion is to be reached, not by starting out in an assumption that we have no more right, or are under no more obligation, to enforce the supremacy of the actually constituted divine principles and laws for human life than the enemies of Christianity have to enthrone error and evil, but by inquiring what, under God's real sovereignty and counsel, is proper and necessary for the best order, peace, welfare, and prosperity of our country. The appeal must be to the Christian conscience of the land, and in the light of the only teaching under the sun that has

right to stand as expressing the real relation of mankind to God. The Christian is surely not entitled at the present day and in relation to this subject, to imply that, after all, Christianity may not be true, or to give it no precedence in questions of civil authority and good and wholesome laws, or to surrender its divine moralities, in order that infidelity, irreligion, and atheism may take the helm and direct our Government. Moreover, the truth of this Christian view of the world and the supremacy of God's will and authority in all human relations, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, is distinctly recognized by the immense majority of the people of our country. Theoretically, this is the faith, either explicit or implicit, of the population of these United States. Only a very small minority have contrary convictions, either intellectual or moral. As included in this view the world is under redemptory and mediatorial government. The only-begotten Son hath revealed the eternal Father. God reigns over the world in and through Jesus Christ, in whom the divine everlasting kingdom is established, under which "all things are to be subdued," every knee bowing in heaven and in earth and under the earth. This "kingdom of heaven" upon earth denotes the establishment of the whole dispensation of redeeming grace, power, and sovereignty in Jesus Christ. It means the re-establishment of the dominion or rule of God wherever human sin has exalted itself against His authority and against righteousness. There is nothing under the stars that is not made amenable to this sovereignty. In it the Son is "Head over all things," with "all power in heaven and on earth." It is the rulership of infinite Love, with the *ethical aim*, in connection with the salvation of men, *to recover human life, in all its relations and activities to order, righteousness, and happiness*. Under this dominion God is moving the administration of the world forward toward the appointed goal of history. Whatever adjusts itself in harmony with His plan and laws and immutable purposes will abide. Whatever refuses and resists must suffer final overthrow. No fair decision can be reached in the question of proper attitude of our Government toward Christianity without bearing in mind that, unless Christianity be utterly untrue, this view of the world stands not as a mere speculative or empty idea, but as the solid reality and actual fact of the constitution under which men and nations exist in an unalterable amenability, from which they can no more withdraw themselves than from the

law of
atheist
denial of
without o

Another
our free
product
been be
and life
fair-min
this. C
of civili
classed
nation
in the
and un
Christi
human
and So
finite
the exa
lofty l
dowed
ties an
impres
respon
to man
is to le
vine o
with
quicke
elevati
horizo
consci
purest
withou
this t
to fre
does r
there
repub
versal
rights
And a
a hou
of hi
freed
nome
move
from
the
nome
tian
the re
out o
heart
erty.
enfra
tion
scien
powe

law of gravitation. Though the infidel or atheist may shape *his* view of the case in denial of all this, the Christian cannot do so without surrendering his Christian position.

Another truth to be kept in mind is that our free government and institutions are the *product* of Christianity. They have not been born of pagan or of atheistic thought and life. They could not have been. No fair-minded student of history will question this. Christian civilization itself is a type of civilization so distinct and alone as to be classed with nothing outside of the illumination of the special divine revelation given in the Holy Scriptures. Without the new and unequalled conception of God which Christianity has created and fixed in the human mind, as the holy Creator, Preserver, and Sovereign Ruler of the universe, of infinite wisdom, power, and love; without the exalted conception it gives of man as a lofty being made in the image of God, endowed with sublime and immortal possibilities and destinies; without the startling and impressive views it gives of the duties and responsibilities of men to God, and of man to man in a brotherhood in which each one is to love others as himself; without its divine ordination of the family constitution with its exalting sanctities; without its quickening power for the human mind, its elevation and enlargement of intellectual horizon, its illumination and invigoration of conscience, and its kindling power for the purest and best sentiments of the heart; without these splendid gifts of Christianity, this type of *civilization*, which gives birth to free institutions, could not exist. Who does not know that, outside of Christendom, there is to-day no civilization in which free republican government, based on the universal rights of man and securing these rights, could be organized or maintained? And as a matter of historic fact, familiar as a household story to every ordinary reader of history, the foundations of American freedom were laid in the unique and phenomenal energies of a special revival and movement of Christian thought and power from the sublime religious reformation of the sixteenth century. That grand phenomenon was a special awakening of Christian thought and life, in connection with the re-opening of a long-closed Bible, raying out God's great truths for the mind and heart of men, and kindling the fires of liberty. Thought was freed and manhood was enfranchised. Out of this came the assertion of the rights of personality and conscience against despotic and persecuting power. From that special revival of pure

Christianity the splendid movement of modern freedom took its rise. The tides of the revived Christianity flowed across the oceans. Men and women came to these shores inspired with high views and intense convictions of Christian truth, heroically refusing any surrender of the rights of Christian conscience, the authority of God's Word, or the supremacy of divine law. When

" Amidst the storm they sang,
And the stars heard and the sea,
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang,
To the anthems of the free,"

their spirit and action held in themselves, and were prophetic of the full outcome of all the Christian statehood and nationality of this free country. All the best authorities as to the facts in the case freely and gratefully recognize the real and fundamental relation of our institutions to the great principles, truths, and powers of Christianity. The colonial life established itself on religious bases and framed municipal and civil administrations in Christian forms. In the solemn hour of signing the Declaration of Independence, the appeal was made "to the Supreme Judge of the world," with expression of "firm reliance on Divine Providence." The Articles of Confederation of 1781 were ratified with a preface: "Whereas it hath pleased the great Governor of the world to incline the hearts of the Legislatures we respectively represent in Congress." Though from the peculiar circumstances of the convention which framed the Constitution, and its purpose to avoid any, even the slightest, union of Church and State, there has been an unfortunate failure to give distinct recognition of God as the source of governmental power, yet all who look at the deeper realities of influence and power which came to consummation in the fundamental law then adopted, and brought our Government to birth, are obliged to confess, as they have done, that Christianity has been the creator of our unique and matchless free institutions. God's saying to Cyrus was true also of that Convention: "I girded thee, though thou recognizedst me not." Daniel Webster declared: "Our ancestors founded their Government on morality and religious sentiment. They were brought here by their high veneration for the Christian religion. They journeyed by its light and labored in its hope. They sought to incorporate it with the elements of their society and to diffuse its influence through all their institutions, civil, political, social, and educational." Though God was not named in the Constitution, the civil order yet estab-

lished and maintained a real and practical connection with essential Christianity. When the Constitution was adopted no one would have dreamed of denying the fact. Any attempt, in the face of the actual Christian sentiment of the people, to insert a clause disrupting the connection and to bar out recognition of Governmental amenability to the will and laws of the God of the Bible, would have evoked universal condemnation. And so a real and working relation has always marked our Governmental and civil administration—Christian ministers employed as chaplains in Congress and State Legislatures, in the army and navy, the Bible in our schools, oaths in inaugurations into public offices and in our courts, laws defending the quiet of the Christian Sabbath, days of humiliation and of thanksgiving by Presidential and Gubernatorial proclamations. These facts, taken together, seem fully to justify the judgment of Chancellor Kent, Justice Story, and other eminent jurists, that Christianity is part of the common law of our land. At any rate, the one chief point is clear beyond dispute, that our free institutions, in which we rejoice and glory, have come out of the teachings, life, and creative powers of Christianity. None of the heathen, infidel, or agnostic "isms" that, mostly immigrant, are now seeking to fight it from its place, have made our free country and its beneficent constitutions.

Shall this product of Christianity repudiate its parentage, or withdraw from all recognition of this relation to Christianity, on the shallow pretence of a Governmental duty to be impartial to all religions and to haters of all? It would not, indeed, be the first time that Christianity, or rather the supreme Jehovah who speaks through it, has had to say: "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against Me." Often have men who have been nourished in knowledge and power by the divine truth, which has gone as quickening and formative forces into them from the intellectual and moral atmosphere about them from childhood, at last used that increased power for denial and displacement of the truth. But will the Christian say that this is right?

This review of underlying principles and facts brings us to the real heart of this great question. This is found in supposed necessities or implications of the fact that by the National Constitution *State and Church are separated*: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This fact has been worked for all that it is worth, and more than it is worth, in the discussions and appeals upon the issues that have arisen. The cry, "Union of Church and State," as the thing supposed to be aimed at, or as involved in a theoretical and practical recognition of God and the supremacy of His laws, or in respect shown to the verities and ethical laws of Christianity, has been freely used as a phantom of terror for the easily disturbed imagination of many—albeit it is as unreal and fictitious as phantoms always are. The Seventh-day Baptists, with their peculiar tenet of a Saturday Sabbath, have harped on this string and vociferated this cry incessantly in opposing all Sabbath laws. But nobody wishes a union of State and Church. In any historical and legitimate sense of such a union, the Church membership of our country are as intensely opposed to it as the bitterest enemies of Christ. There are no advocates of it among us, and it is high time that the phantom fear of it should be allowed to dissolve. Church and State are in this free land to be forever separate—and this much more for the Church's sake than the State's. But more and more has the conception of this separation been magnified and distorted to mean not only a separation of Church and State, but of State from essential Christianity and God and the moral laws He has ordained for the order and welfare of life. And "separation," in some respects and some places, is made to mean exclusion and *prohibition*, as when the Word of God is *not allowed* to be used in the public schools of some States. While the Constitution only says: "Congress shall make no law respecting the *establishment* of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," claim is made for an interpretation that shall not only exclude a union of Church and State, but require the State to reduce itself, in its own functions and over the whole domain of its operations, to a purely and positively secular or atheistic basis and action. Thus, instead of its being held, as intended, simply to guard the people against Governmental encroachment upon the rights of conscience and to guarantee forever complete freedom of thought and worship—or no worship, if that may please—it is sought to force it into the character of a fundamental law for the Government's theoretical, practical, and positive repudiation of religion in all its official functions, that, so far as its working forms and attitude are concerned, it shall absolve itself from amenability to God, and permit to flow through the pulses of its offi-

cial action
ly Christia
is true, is
representa
fanatical
ing parag
many of
are dispos
aration be
and dange
It is prop
ciously the

What t
ception o
sense, wi
of God,
Christ in
not ident
compreh
gal auth
of the "
things,"
earth,"
"King
"rule"
cial admi
duced to
recovery
to God
governm
eighty
God's
and rec
to own
and rej
anity a
out of
civiliza
darkne
affairs
vine i
versal
organ
ly acc
submi
tuitio
Chur
and
lifting
ness
secul
and
plish
welf
B
tion
inte
tha
clai
fide
gov

cial action no drop of blood of a distinctively Christian piety. This extreme view, it is true, is held by only a very few—it being representative of the “demands” of the fanatical secularists noticed in our opening paragraph—yet we are convinced that many of the sincerest friends of religion are disposed to give to the principle of separation between Church and State an undue and dangerous significance and application. It is proper, therefore, to scan more precisely the facts and principles involved.

What is the “Church?” No just conception of it, either in biblical or historical sense, will confound it with the sovereignty of God, or the dominion or rulership of Christ in the earth. The two things are not identical in reality, nor conterminous in comprehension. The rights of Christ’s regal authority extend far beyond the limits of the “Church” as such—“Head over all things,” with “all power in heaven and on earth,” “whose throne is forever and ever,” “King of kings and Lord of lords,” to “rule” in gracious, providential, and judicial administration till all things are subdued to Himself. It is a dominion for the recovering of all things human to allegiance to God and harmony with His supreme government and righteousness. The sovereignty of Christ is simply another name for God’s sovereignty and rights of rulership and recognition in the world. To attempt to own God’s kingship, apart from Christ, and rejecting Him, is to renounce Christianity and take pagan ground, to step back out of the light of Christian thinking and civilization and to seek to make heathen darkness and misconception directive for affairs. But the *Church* is a particular divine institution that falls under this universal rulership of God in Christ. It is the organized assembly of those who professedly accept Christ’s gracious rulership and submit themselves in heart and life to His tuition and service. The functions of the Church are distinctively religious, spiritual, and ethical—the salvation of souls and the lifting of character out of sin into righteousness and love. It is not an institution for secular functions—though, by its spiritual and ethical work, it incidentally accomplishes a most benign service for the secular welfare and interests of mankind.

But the *State* is another divine institution, constituted and ordained for temporal interests and welfare. We all know, indeed, that there is a shallow theory, long ago proclaimed by Hobbes and adopted by the infidel French encyclopedists, which makes government a mere *human* institution, a

voluntary social compact, deriving all its rights and authority from the consent of the governed. The source is supposed to be ultimate in the people, and civil government stands simply and purely for a delegation of powers by the individuals or people who set it up. Of course this superficial notion may be consistently accepted by atheists and even by deists; but how can a Christian adopt it, with his theistic view of the world and with the Word of God open before him? for neither reason nor revelation will tolerate it. Government has, necessarily, a divine ground even in the view of rational theism alone. Its necessity and foundations have been laid by the Author of nature in the social constitution of the race. Man is framed into an organism of social life. Apart from this he cannot live and exercise the powers and adaptations of his nature, or come to the character or happiness for which his constitution clearly destines him. God writes an ordaining law and issues his voice of proclamation as truly through His action in creation as in supernatural revelation. Ocean and star, returning seasons and revolving planets, proclaim distinct ordinations of His supreme will. So Government is a divine institution by God’s construction of human relations and life. As a necessity thus ordained of God, it has existence by no optional delegation of individual rights. There is no such thing as individual right to govern other men, and government stands for an authority and function in excess of what even all the individuals have to convey. But beyond this clear divine basis given it by natural law, revelation distinctly and with ringing emphasis gives it this origin and relation: “Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power withstandeth the ordinance of God; and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good and thou shalt have praise from the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience’ sake. For this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God’s service, attending continually upon this very thing” (Rom. 13:1-6).

This is the *Christian* view, the apostle's affirmations which we have italicized showing, by their directness and iteration, how fundamental for correct thinking on the subject, he felt a clear recognition of this *divine* character and position of government to be. This view, therefore—though the voice of some ministers of the Gospel is sometimes heard repudiating it in the interest of Hobbes's secularistic fiction—stands, not as an idle notion, but as a solid and immovable reality to which mankind are to adjust themselves and their “little systems.” Not, indeed, that any *particular form* of government is divine to the exclusion of others, but government generically viewed, the civil state itself, with its essential function and service. The *form* of government may be of compact, not the fact. Anarchy is not a privilege of the race. Magistracy is God's institution, and its officers are “*God's ministers for good, attending continually on this very thing.*”

Now the question in the present issue is not at all a question of the relation between these two divine institutions, the Church and the State. As to *this* relation the three most marked theories are too well known to need more than passing mention. The first asserts supremacy of the Church over the State. This is the doctrine of Rome. The Pope, as assumed head of the Church, claims supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power. He would put his foot on the neck of kings. The second view asserts a supremacy of the State over the affairs of the Church, reversing the theory of Rome. The civil ruler becomes the head of the Church, and the Church is made subject to State regulations as to creed, organization, and worship. This order is usually known as a “union of Church and State.” It is illustrated in the general practice of European Protestant countries. The third is the American view, *reciprocal independence*, each being regarded as a divine institution, with distinct sphere of administration, the one charged with the secular order and welfare, the other having spiritual functions and service. The State owes its citizens protection in all their rights, religious as well as secular. It has no authority, however, to interfere with the Church's autonomy or self-government. On the other hand, the Church has no right to assume the functions of civil administration. But the question now before the country is *not at all* this question of the relation between Church and State, which, as already said, has been settled on a basis of reciprocal independence in their own spheres, but a ques-

tion of the relation of the State or Government to the sovereignty of God, the dominion of our Lord Jesus Christ as not only “King of saints,” but “King of kings,” and to the great moral principles and laws divinely established for human relations and all temporal affairs, and revealed in Christianity. The crucial point in the inquiry, as here reached, is whether, while the Church as a divine institution is confessedly bound, in its sphere, to this divine rulership and the supremacy of these laws, this other great institution, government, is also amenable to them in its sphere or may hold itself absolved from all regard to them. For this is what the secular theory, as already indicated, in fact amounts to. It means that practically, as well as in theory, the State, in addition to its separation from the Church, shall now assume an absolutely non-Christian, non-religious character in all its attitudes and official functions, legislative, administrative, and judicial. As about this point turns the whole issue of this momentous problem with which our country is now wrestling, we must examine with special care the supposed validity of this absolute secularization of government.

The utter untenableness and wrong of this demand becomes evident by recalling some guiding facts.

First of all, it is in clear contradiction to the *source* of governmental power. As magistracy, “ordained of God,” stands in its generic position as a “minister of God” for human good, it cannot but strike every thoughtful mind as bold and glaring absurdity, when the claim is put forth that no divine relations or duties are connected with the civil office, and that this “minister of God” is fairly entitled to repudiate God's authority and refuse the application of His laws in His own institution. He is expected to take the office and lock the owner out. The claim that the civil power may withdraw all recognition of God and play the rôle of practical atheism, turns the order of its administration into direct conflict with the very ground of its own right of existence and exercise of authority. It would employ a divine institution to hush within the province of its functions and the sound of its movement all acknowledgment of the divine name or respect for the divine will and laws. It requires “the minister of God” to deny that he is ministering at all in the name of God, but purely in the name of the people, and so as thoroughly to guard their civil and governmental independence of any “higher” government over the world. A legislator, judge, or president may be per-

sonally
ulariti
Christ
action
the na
theory
concep
law, t
these
en rap
has c
holdi
ligati
of the
incon
ernm
secul

It
the g
man
to th
at on
The
no p
oblig
ity c
apar
ralit
are
and
on t
ban
is n
gre
law
Chr
pea
hun
side
ble
the
wh
ord
rig
mi
tio
ph
rel
les

fu
go
th
al
w
ti
of
w
o
g
o

sonally a Christian, and in his private secularities may conduct business according to Christian moral standard, but in all official action, he is to decide questions and direct the nation's life on the basis of the atheist's theory of the world. According to this conception of enacting and administering law, the atheist would be the fittest man for these divinely constituted functions—more *en rapport* with the duties than one who has come under the Christian principle of holding all secularities subject to ethical obligations, and doing all things in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such burning inconsistency with the divine source of government is itself disproof of this extreme secular demand.

It stands, too, in direct contradiction to the great truth of the amenability of *all* human affairs to the will and laws of God. As to this amenability, even natural theism is at one with the affirmations of Christianity. The Christian acknowledges that there are no parts of his life or affairs outside of this obligation. He admits the utter incongruity of holding any spheres of his activity apart from the regulation of Christian morality. He recognizes that the divine laws are supreme, not only for private thought and feelings, but for business transactions, on the farm, in the counting-house, in the bank, in all trade and commerce. There is no provided exemption for social clubs or great corporations. God's sovereignty and laws, in and through the dominion of Jesus Christ, sweep the earth in complete, irrepealable supremacy; and not an inch of human life or human relations is left outside of a sure amenability, from the humblest toils of the laborer in shop or field, to the high duties of a monarch or a president whom Providence has set to look after the order and well-being of a nation. By what right can it be claimed that the civil administration may hold all its vast operations, affecting all the interests of men, physically, intellectually and morally, as released from these omnipresent and ceaseless obligations?

With equal certainty is this demand for full secularization in conflict with the great goal in the aim of the divine purpose with the world—the annulling of the world's alienation and its recovery into harmony with the divine order. The whole Christian world is set to praying for the coming of God's kingdom and for obedience to His will on earth as in heaven. But what if one of God's own institutions, the total civil government of the earth, the very rulership of the world, the most tremendous and

dominating power on this planet, determining the life and character and institutions of the nations and the course of history, is to be conducted without recognition of, or practical respect for, the divine plan and laws in Jesus Christ? If civil government, the regulative dominion of all lands, controlling social order and touching and moulding life everywhere and in almost everything, is not to be put in accord with the laws of Christ, how are human affairs ever to be Christianized and “the kingdoms of this world” ever to become “the kingdoms of our Lord?” The State stands as forbidding application of the divine supremacy. In the theory of full State independence and secularization, government, even in the most Christian nations, is entitled to remain atheistic or pagan to the end of time, and go on enacting un-Christian laws and subjecting the people to their corrupting regulation and immoral blight. It is excused from ever feeling the touch of Christ's reign so as to beat swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks and learn war no more. The malign spirit of war and conquest, of ambition, ungodliness, and corruption, may sit forever at the helm of State and direct the course of human affairs.

It is, moreover, witnessed against by the history of God's dealings in connection with civil action in the past. Not only in the early theocracy, but in the Jewish government under the kings, the civil administration was held bound to respect God's will and authority as truly as were the Church, priesthood, and common people. Any attempt to divorce the functions of the State from obedience was visited with divine displeasure, forming for after ages a mirror of God's mind on the subject. In all the prophecies, too, of the coming Christian day, of the new order of things under our dispensation, Christ's kingly rule over men and civil administrations was put into the front. The kingdom was foretold as destined to break in pieces all opposing kingdoms. “All kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him.” Kings should come to the brightness of His rising. And when Christ came, and though accepted and received as King by thousands on thousands in their personal capacity, was rejected by the rulers, both in Jewish and Roman administration, an official illustration of the governmental secularism which says: “We will not have this man to rule over us,” the warning voice uttered long before in the ears of Israel took effect: “The nation that will not serve Thee shall perish.”

The Jewish people remain, but the nation is gone. And just as truly does the fact stand out in the providential history of the ages since that day, as before, that the Government or State that assumes independence of God's laws of order in human affairs, making and executing laws in violation of God's laws, disharmonizes its action with the fixed and irreversible conditions of welfare, and sends down disordering influences through all society, bringing into action forces of penalty and judgment on the land. Human thrones, whether in republics or monarchies, need to keep themselves at the foot of God's throne.

Especially in a land like ours, where the Government is simply "the people" acting in organized capacity, this principle holds in fullest sway. What can warrant a Christian people in saying, collectively, in word or action: "We will be Christian and acknowledge the authority and laws of God in private life, home, business, trade, pleasures, in everything except in our politics, or the way we will govern our State affairs, but in this large business, in deference to infidels, atheists, Jews, and Nihilists among us, Christianity shall be as if it were not, and we will show no more allegiance to God than to the Chinese idol Joss. In such a course a Christian people presents the spectacle, not only of adopting an atheistic order of legislation and administration for themselves, but in the supposed interest of impartial religious freedom enthroning the will of the smallest and worst class in the land, the conglomerate class of those who would obliterate Christianity. Does this escape one-sidedness? Does true, impartial religious freedom require this throwing of the reins into the hands of this class? An essentially Christian administration of the "powers that be," under our system of separation of Church from State and our full religious toleration, takes away no man's rights of conscience. What authority has the anti-Christian conscience above the Christian conscience, to demand that, in addition to full personal religious or irreligious liberty, the State administration shall be submitted to its direction and shaped into the harmony of its low particularistic type?

But we are to add yet the consideration that this extreme secular theory destroys the best efficiency of the State in its own sphere. The State exists for temporal order and welfare. But this can come only along with the intelligence and virtue of the people. It is a political aphorism that the State is not made great by the stretch of its territory, the vastness of its resources, or

the greatness of its armies or navies, but by the high manhood and womanhood of its citizens, the pureness of its morality, the order and prosperity of all useful industries, the culture and excellence of life, the energy and profit of all legitimate enterprise. The excellence of the State is represented by its happy homes, peaceful security to person and property, advancement in learning, progress in science and art, and everything that lifts life to its true dignity and fulfils its purpose. "To political prosperity," said Washington, "religion and morality are indispensable supports. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them." Even for social and temporal order, there is no ethical system equal to the Christian. And there is no dynamic for a safe and sure moral life apart from the great truths of religion. "Let us with caution," adds Washington, "indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion." "We know," says Burke, "and, what is better, we feel inwardly, that religion is the basis of civil society, and the source of all good and of all comfort." The best welfare of the State is bound up indissolubly with the moral and religious life of the people. Even within the official functions, so immensely varied, extending through every city, town, and hamlet within the wide borders of the land, and employing hundreds of thousands of agents, there must come weakness and corruption of administration, if agents and aims and methods are to be uninfluenced by recognition of God, or the great laws of Christian morality and released from the high motives of religious truth and responsibility. It must open the political field for the full operations of demagogery, and prepare the way for ever-increasing perversion of public offices from the service of the people into places of ambition, gain, and tyranny. And the corruption and blight thus admitted into the whole Governmental service will send down bad influences through all classes, and lower the moral tone and the sway of religious motives in the common life of the people. The Government cannot, by example, teach the principle of transacting secular affairs in divorce from the moral requirements of Christianity and the sanctions of religion, without affecting large masses of the general population. If Christian morality is needful for the best national order and prosperity, the Government cannot refuse it positive encouragement and make its own practice discredit its value or necessity, without not only sinking itself into inferior efficiency for its own divinely-given

task—the
of its sub
blighting
realm of
and foster

Among
which t
secularis
chief, u
with ou
laws, an

Confe
State ca
is the ne
secured
fare. V
belongs
moral a
popular
ple, by
develop
univers
duties
the pur
stitution
the CH
and de
ests.

has co
the St
by Sta
But in
Roman
the n
ment,
rende
lic ed
comp
sion i
for it
recen
Allia
publi
Hobb
powe
Bible
all to
seem
cry
the
the
cons
of t
part
of b
whi
rev
cruc
tre
qu

task—the best temporal order and welfare of its subjects—but also sending positively blighting influences over into the whole realm of interests it is ordained to guard and foster.

Among the particular applications in which this new theory of extreme State secularism is forcing the issue of to-day, the chief, unquestionably, are in connection with our public education, our marriage laws, and the Christian Sabbath.

Confessedly, the only basis on which the State can take up the business of education is the need, or at least the benefit, thereby secured for its own temporal order and welfare. While normally the teaching function belongs to parents, and for distinctively moral and spiritual ends to the Church, our popular form of government, “of the people, by the people, and for the people,” has developed a strong sense of the necessity of universal education to qualify for the high duties of citizenship and as a safeguard for the purity and permanence of our free institutions. It proposes to educate not for the Church’s ends, but for ends desirable and desired within its own sphere of interests. And so the system of common schools has covered the whole land, and in many of the States universities have been established by State provision and under State control. But in the presence of the discontent of the Roman Catholics, and before the pressure of the non-Christian and anti-Christian element, there has been surrender after surrender of the Christian features of our public education, threatening their total and complete exclusion. This complete exclusion is seconded by many ministers. A plea for it was heard from the platform of the recent Boston meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, and appears in the volume of the published proceedings—a plea based on Hobbes’s deistic notion of the source of civil power. Indeed, the displacement of the Bible from our public schools and hushing all teaching of its moral or religious truths, seems about to be made the great rallying cry of secularism. The recent decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin disallowing the reading of the Scriptures in the schools, considered in connection with the attitude of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and more particularly in view of the violent travesty of both logic and sense in the reasoning by which the decision was reached, startlingly reveals the fanaticism of the inaugurated crusade.

It is certainly unfortunate for the extreme secularists, however, that this school question, which they hold up as specially

and pre-eminently showing the correctness of the view they are urging, itself stands as the problem whose only true and safe solution demands the utter defeat of this secularistic fanaticism and folly. It is an offence alike against reason, Christianity, and patriotism. A few considerations suffice to show this.

The alleged need of it, to avoid sectarian instruction and consequent compromise of relation between Church and State, all disappears like flying mist when examined. The reasoning is vicious by a double fault. It confounds Christianity itself with sectarianism, and then becomes sectarian under pretence of impartiality. Without dissent we all concede, and even demand that there must be no *sectarian* instruction in the public schools. But surely “non-sectarian” must not be made synonymous with no religion at all. There is an immense field of religion that is not sectarian, but common and broad as human nature—a vast realm of theistic and religious truth and duty not disputed, save by a few abnormal exceptions to manhood. Why, in order to harmonize religious sects in the use of the school, should it be imagined that we must eject what all the religious sects hold in common? The truth is, that there is no right in classing God’s Word as a sectarian book, or justness in a Christian country’s consenting for a moment to have it so classed. For even Romanism, whose attitude has raised this question of exclusion, claims the Bible in support of its religious teachings, though it claims a right also to establish doctrines on the ground of tradition and its own infallible authority. And every intelligent man among us knows full well that the great doctrines of God—immortality, redemption by Jesus Christ, personal responsibility, future retribution, etc., are parts of Rome’s theological teaching. We believe with Judge Pitman, when in answer to the question, Can the public schools teach a common Christianity? he says: “It were, indeed, a scandal to our religion, if there were no ground upon which its nominal adherents could stand together. Can it be that our schools must be pagan because we are sectarian? Such a conclusion is repugnant to the common-sense of the community.” Professor Huxley, indeed, in his discussion with Professor Wace, has said, in substance, that it is not possible, amid the conflicting representations, to find out what Christianity really is. He made this declaration, however, as a professed agnostic. But will our *Christian* men say so, who wish to apply the idea, as if true, to the school problem? There could be no more

baseless assumption than for a Christian people, in their order of self-government, to treat the Bible, which the denominations all accept, as a sectarian book.

But further, this secularism establishes a sectarian order for the schools in pretence of excluding sectarian relation. The thing, and the only thing, that needs to be excluded, is a teaching of the distinctive doctrines and claims of any particular sect, but the thing excluded, in fact, is the essential truths and moral duties which are common to all. The very opposition of Rome to the reading of the Bible by the people, out of school as well as in it, is itself a feature of the narrowest and intensest sectarianism—a disreputable particularity which has stood in the way of spiritual, mental, and civic freedom for long ages, and is an anachronism in our age and country. In the schools and universities supported by States the widest liberty is allowed in the use of books and non-Christian teaching. The paganisms of ancient Greece and Rome, the Vedas of Hindu theology, the Avestas of Persia, or the Egyptian Book of the Dead, may be read or interpreted. But the Christian Scriptures, with the essential Christianity which has created our civilization and free country, are sought to be put out. Constitutions and Legislatures and courts are invoked simply against positive Christianity, and to guard, so far as school exercises are concerned, the mind of the young from contact with its moral and spiritual truths. The displacement of the Bible from our public education becomes in reality the adoption, so far as the order of our common schools are concerned, of the specialty of Roman Catholic sectarianism as to the non-use of the Scriptures, and a governmental enforcement of it in the daily education, not only upon Roman Catholic citizenship, but also upon all the Protestant population and those unconnected with any church. It concedes more to the wishes of a single sect as against the Bible in education, than to the wishes of all the rest as in its favor; and it proceeds, in deference to a hierarchy which is sworn in supreme allegiance to a potentate beyond the seas, to establish that Roman sectarian peculiarity for the order of our American school system. And in relation to the enemies of Christianity and of all religion, it adopts a practically atheistic basis in an order of “no religious instruction” in the provided education. This gives to the atheistic and non-religious view the actual determination and control, so far as included in the public schools, of the common education. Should this “godless” or-

der satisfy Protestants any better than it does Roman Catholics? For it is to be borne in mind that the Catholic hierarchy, often against the wishes of Catholics, are not seeking “godless schools” as an end, but driving toward secularization with the purpose of compelling the overthrow of the school system, or a division of the school funds. The enemies of Christianity will not tolerate that the Christian view should determine the order and character of our common school education. Why should we tolerate—not their personal freedom—but that their view shall decide and control the character of the entire public education of the State or nation? What special rights or merit has that view? Yielding to its dictation, instead of avoiding, actually establishes in practical control the smallest and worst class or “sect” in the land.

But this scheme of secularizing the public schools shows itself worthy of condemnation, especially when questioned as to its competency for the high task of true and safe education. If, as Daniel Webster, in the Supreme Court of the United States in the Girard will case, declared: “The Christian religion, in its general principles, must ever be regarded as among us the foundation of civil society,” it becomes a vital inquiry what sort of education is best adapted to promote the civil welfare and maintain our free institutions. Is it that which drops out of view the common Christianity which has created our high civilization and free Government? There is no risk in affirming that, as the secularistic view of life and the world did not create for us our goodly heritage, it must be incompetent to the service of continuing it. This incompetence is frankly and fully confessed, even by those who are urging us to yield to secularization. The speech, already referred to, before the Boston meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, puts the truth so clearly that we are tempted to quote: “As members of the Christian Church, as citizens of the Christian commonwealth, we believe that no education is complete, ay, more, that no education is safe without religious nurture; unless the moral nature be educated as well as the intellectual, the heart as well as the brain. Mental training by itself will not make men honest, will not make them truthful, will not make them pure. Purity, honesty, truthfulness, these are moral qualities, and must be educated by moral processes. But moral processes, in order to be efficient, must be associated with religious processes; for morality rests on religion—that is, it rests on God. God is the ground of all moral ob-

ligation must, Jesus system unless moralit teach religion tian pe that n suffici with t ion su

Wor the in and m young ter, a and p man n tion, other order Chris propo powe tian longe Plau part the C try Chr they is do lisho by t the inst Thi clos of stre hon the you and min tha abl are rea of pa pe ca sch tiv fo th be

ligation, and, if it rests on God, then it must, of course, rest on God as revealed in Jesus Christ, for there is no other. No system of education, therefore, is complete unless it teach morality; and if it teach morality, it must teach religion; and if it teach religion, it must teach the Christian religion. This, at least, is what we Christian people believe, and hence we believe that no education of the young is safe and sufficient education unless it be associated with that nurture which the Christian religion supplies."

Words could hardly express more finely the indispensable necessity of the religious and moral elements in the education of the young. From these come the life, character, and virtues necessary to social welfare and prosperity. The religious side of human nature is a part of its normal constitution, and needs development along with the other parts, if we are to have true or well-ordered humanity. How, then, do our Christian advocates of the secularist scheme propose to retain or secure the beneficent powers of Christian education when Christian truth and Christian morals are no longer taught in the public schools? Plausibly enough, they say the Christian part of the education is to be supplied by the Church. "If the children of this country are to receive Christian education, the Christian Church must give it to them or they will not receive it; and the work that is done in the non-religious schools established by the State must be supplemented by the influence of the Christian family, by the teaching of the Christian pulpit, by the instruction of the Christian Sunday-school." This looks well—as long as we keep our eyes closed to the stern and almost frightful facts of the case. No man could place more stress than we do on the duty of Christian home instruction and nurture, and upon the Church's obligation to teach all the young it can reach through Sunday-schools and every available channel of access to their minds and hearts. But who does not know that, despite all that the Church has been able to do or is likely to accomplish, there are immense masses of our population unreached by the Church's instructions, tens of thousands of children never submitted by parents to the Church's training, found especially in our great cities, whose sole education is that supplied by our common schools? Indeed, there would be comparatively little necessity of the common schools for the proper education of the children of the Church. The public school system has been meant, for civil and political well-be-

ing, to sweep the young under a more universal preparation for the sacred duties of intelligent and pure citizenship. It is not with respect to the children of the Church that the State is anxious in the presence of the ballot without proper education, but with respect to the hundreds of thousands not under Church culture. Now, while it is to be well remembered that the State does not undertake to educate those for spiritual results, or their personal salvation—that would be an intrusion into the function and mission of the Church—and the churches in their special organizations have no right to have the State's funds handed over to them in the interest of their distinctive views, it is still clear as daylight that for the very and only ends for which the State educates at all—*i.e.*, social and civic welfare, it needs the best inclusion and power of essential Christianity and its ethical precepts and sanctions. If, through constitutions, laws, and court rulings, the teachers of its schools cannot hold up in hand the Bible, teach reverence for God and respect for divine law as well as human, and instil into the opening minds and hearts of the children the Christian forces of our civilization and the principles of New Testament morality, the State has despoiled itself of its competence for the teaching function. To attempt to conduct it in this vitiated form must bring disaster to the very interests for which the teaching task has been undertaken. In view of all these facts, this demand for the absolute secularization of our schools has neither justice, piety, nor patriotism to commend it.

This conclusion holds in full force against the same method in State universities. The utter un-Christianizing of the higher education, the exclusion of the touch of divine truth from philosophy, science, and sociology, among those who step up into the ruling places of thought and life, cannot be wholesome for secular purity and civil well-being. As long as God does not withdraw the necessity of religion for the good order of the world's secular affairs, the divorcement of it from civic education is unphilosophical and unnatural. The establishment of a National University on this false basis would be another step in the wrong direction. If the Government must exclude Christianity, it would better forego the university.

There is another relation of this absolute secularization of the common schools—the driving of others besides Roman Catholics into the parochial school system. Romanist tactics against the public schools are accompanied by the establishment of an immense

system of parochial schools, an education under a hierarchy in allegiance to a foreign influence, and isolating more widely the Catholic part of the population from the common American life. This is justly felt to be an evil and a danger. But the extreme secularism of the schools is impelling other churches to separate education. And though these are without dictation from a foreign power or alliance with a foreign system, the parochial system tends to aggravate sectarian divisions and prevent a homogeneous social State.

The human-compact and non-Christian theory of government is equally inconsistent with a safe and sure settlement of the laws of marriage and the defence of the integrity of the family. The protection of this social unit from demoralization is essential to the happy constitution of the whole social and civic organism. Can our loose and diversified legislation on marriage and divorce, the source of disorders and wrongs threatening us with untold evils, be rightly corrected and unified except by recognizing the divine law in the case and resting the authority of the human legislation upon that? By what law but the law of God as revealed in Christianity is bigamy or polygamy rightly made punishable as a crime, a *malum in se*? On the secularist idea, and left simply to the different and changeable determinations of passing majorities, the true and stable foundation can never be reached.

And what of Sabbath or Sunday legislation? One of the strangest and most surprising phenomena of our day is the ingenious and labored effort of some of our Christian writers to find a Sabbath for civil enforcement other than that of God's ordination, one not resting on divine authority but adopted by the majority on the social compact basis. It seeks only a "work-free Sunday." It says: "We observe two Sabbaths, entirely distinct in origin, character, and authority: the one civil, the other religious. The latter is divine in its origin and authority, and sacred in character; the former, the civil Sabbath, is wholly human in its origin and authority and secular in its character." This is an amazing solution of the Sunday question. It begins by assuming what does not exist—"two Sabbaths." If there is a Sabbath at all, it is the one and only Sabbath that "was made for man," and of which Jesus Christ is Lord, a Sabbath made for man when man was made, and "for man" as long as the race of man exists, needing it either intellectually, socially, morally, religiously, or physically—enacted by the double ordination of a crea-

tionally established necessity for it in human life and of a given law for it. No Sabbath laws have ever been framed in our land or in the civilized nations of Christendom except in reference to this one Sabbath. Another, "entirely distinct in its origin," is a pure fiction. Then, it proposes to take this other Sabbath, establishing it as "wholly human" by the simple authority of the State, but making it "coincide" with the day of the divine Sabbath. Thus the Christian people of the country will be allowed to have the rest, quiet, and privileges of the divine Sabbath incidentally under cover of this human institution. This plan deserves a patent. Often, indeed, a counterfeit note has had currency in the currency of the genuine article. But here the counterfeit thing is proposed in order to maintain the true. Now it is easy to understand how a State, recognizing a Sabbath made by God "for man," may, without being afraid of thereby giving incidental encouragement to religion, guard that day as a "work-free" day in conditions of quiet and good order, not for spiritual results, but for the sake of the special temporal welfare for which secular government exists. But it is difficult to see any reason for inventing and superimposing this "wholly human" Sabbath. For two great questions at once arise. One is: How does this new two-Sabbath fiction or any other secularistic notion increase the State's authority or ability to ordain and defend a "work-free" Sabbath? The State's right to act in the case rests in its office of promoting State well-being. Is this right increased by claiming a merely human authority for the day? Is it best and most strengthening thus to push the day, with its civil defences, from the divine basis in which it stands in the support of the Christian conscience of the land, to one in which it stands only in the human law-making power, subject to the changes of judgment and preference of majorities? The truth is that when the tides of disorder, greed, lust of gain, helped by irreligion and anarchism, beat against the Sabbath, it needs a defence and support which it can have only by fostering in our whole population the strongest sense of the truth of its basis in the law of Him who is the Supreme Ruler of the world, to whom men and nations are responsible.

The other question is: Would a Sabbath on this low conception and import be the best, or even sufficient for the State's own welfare? It would be only a "work-free" day. It is true the State looks only to temporal good. But can the State secure the

true and moral and it not high be secure as a holiday, as tion, are economic these, with or religious full need which bring even ment to meet its to the l without

THE

BY

THE to a st the wh done, learn think more ment. given have nume tabul that Scrip this roun If theol what stud nove any the him dig life who who I gin the not tru bei art

true and full temporal good apart from the moral and religious life of the people? Has it not high interests of its own impossible to be secured by defending the Sabbath only as a holiday instead of as a holy day? Holidays, as a rule, by their license and dissipation, are largely days of both moral and economic loss. If the State makes only these, without regard to Christian morality or religion, it is not measuring up to the full necessities of the grand interests with which it is charged. The failure must bring evil. And the right thing for Government to do, in this Christian country, is to meet its sacred and irrevocable obligations to the law of God without ambiguity and without compromise.

THE PRESENT DESIDERATA OF THEOLOGY.

BY REV. JAMES STALKER, M.A., LL.D.

From *The Expositor* (London), April, 1890.

THERE can be nothing more discouraging to a student of theology than the notion that the whole work of theology has been already done, and that nothing now remains but to learn by heart the results arrived at by past thinkers and retail them to the public with more or less adroitness and variety of statement. The data, it is said, of theology are given in the Bible, the contents of the Bible have been sifted through the minds of innumerable expositors, the results have been tabulated in systems of theology; and all that we have to do is to convert texts of Scripture into vessels with which to dip into this lukewarm reservoir, and hand them round for the general consumption.

If this really be the position in which the theological student finds himself in our day, what a contrast it presents to that of the student of science! The latter lives among novelties and surprises; he may alight at any moment on a revolutionary discovery; the horizon is constantly widening around him, and new fields tempt him to come and dig in the virgin soil. This is the kind of life which every true thinker must covet, where there is scope for originality and where research will find its reward.

But the notion that, whilst science is virgin soil, the field of theology is exhausted, though it enjoys extensive popularity, is nothing but a prejudice and a delusion. The truth is, the work of theology, so far from being exhausted, is at present terribly in arrears. The progress of thought in other

departments of human interest has brought to the front many questions of great importance which are awaiting replies; but, in the meantime, within the Church speculation is in a far from vigorous condition. The Church is occupied with different work. After generations of torpor she has awakened to an overwhelming sense of her duty to apply the gospel to the life of the population at home and to carry it to the heathen abroad. The instrumentalities for giving effect to these impulses have been so multiplied, that every congregation is a hive of activities, which it requires the whole time and strength of the minister to direct. Even the professors in our colleges are tempted aside from their proper work to absorb themselves in all kinds of benevolent enterprises.

In some ways this state of things is gratifying, for these are signs of revived spiritual life. But meantime the work of speculation languishes and the unanswered questions accumulate, to the world's perplexity and the Church's danger. William Ames, a godly and orthodox divine of a former age, once well known, but now, I fear, nearly forgotten, says in his great work on *Conscience*, that in his day also the same thing took place: under the reviving breath of the Spirit of God evangelistic activity prevailed, the best spirits giving themselves entirely up to it; and, whilst this was regarded as the body of the Church's duty, the toil of thought and speculation was valued only as the body's smaller members. But, says he, it turned out that these small members were the fingers and toes of the body; and without fingers and toes the hands and feet came to be of little use; and without hands and feet the body threatened to become a helpless log, tossed on the currents of the thought of the time. As in the building of the new Jerusalem, he continues, they handled the sword with one hand, while they built the wall with the other, so must evangelistic activity and sacred speculation go hand in hand, if the Church is to be in a healthy state and equal to her whole duty.

This is a true testimony. Through exclusive preoccupation with even the highest work, the Church may expose herself to irreparable damage. The world around the Church never stands still. In our day it is in swift and violent motion; and out of the troubled element new knowledge, new ideals, and new problems are rising in bewildering numbers. Unless the Church has at least a part of her mind disengaged to deal with these new births of time—to understand them and absorb them—even

the most saintly devotion to practical work will not save her from losing hold of the minds of men.

This is part of the work of the ministry. It is not enough to station on the watch-towers a few men to look out for the signs of the time. Only the diffusion through the teachers of the people as a body of an intelligence able to take a wide survey and a firm grasp of the questions as they arise will enable the Christian faith still to continue what its Founder intended it to be, a leaven leavening the whole lump of human life.

A wise man has said that every minister, besides possessing a competent acquaintance with the whole field of theology, ought to have a specialty of which he is master; he ought to be spoken of as the man who knows so-and-so. Probably this is every aspiring student's ideal. But the efforts put forth in this direction are often comparatively fruitless, through ignorance of the lines of study which are the most hopeful and remunerative at the time. A student would naturally choose for his specialty a field that is fresh and unexhausted. There are certain directions in which earnest and original work is more pressingly needed than in others, and work done there will be more exhilarating to the student than work attempted elsewhere. It is the purpose of this paper to point out where these comparatively virgin and undeveloped fields are, which at present invite the work of fresh and willing thinkers.

I.

Undoubtedly the great new phenomenon of the intellectual world in this age is natural science, and the hypothesis with which science is working is EVOLUTION. Darwin, now that his laborious life is ended, is beginning to be regarded in many quarters as the greatest man of recent times. A hundred young disciples, who worship him, are spreading his doctrines in exaggerated and dogmatic forms. He was always ready to acknowledge the difficulties lying in the way of his ideas; but they are ready to draw out the scheme of the universe, in all its elements, physical and spiritual, as an unbroken evolution from primeval matter.

It is an imposing panorama which is thus unfolded. The universe is an infinite mass of world-forming material in all stages of growth. Here it is utterly rude and shapeless; there form is just beginning to emerge out of chaos; in a third case matter has reached full organization; in a fourth it is tumbling from organization back again to

chaos. Our world is only one of millions of experiments of this kind; and in it there has been a gradual ascent from the crudest forms, until man, with the exquisite flower of his intellectual and moral life, has been evolved. How far the evolution may still proceed none can tell; but no doubt our world, like the rest, will sink back into the chaos out of which it has arisen, and again form part of the raw material out of which new experiments of the same kind will in the future be produced. All is under the government of natural law, which is derived from no Lawgiver, but is inherent in the structure of things, and works out its results as a blind perpetual motion.

If any one wishes to see how imposing to the imagination such a history of the universe may be made, he should read the description of it in a book like Strauss' *Old and New Faith*, where it is depicted with an almost poetical dignity and with the warmth of sincere, if somewhat bitter, conviction. As a creed, it has laid strong hold of the mind of Europe, especially on the Continent, and it begins to spread in the East among the educated classes of India and Japan. In this country the cooler heads acknowledge the breaks which interrupt the demonstration; but as a working hypothesis, it has given such a stimulus to discovery, and, between the breaks, the results are so imposing, that there is a constant tendency to overlook these limitations and give it a universal application. The popular mind feels the charm of an idea which brings the details gathered from a hundred fields under a single point of view; and perhaps no other idea of this kind is so fascinating in itself as that of growth—the long extended unfolding of the higher out of the lower.

Here, then, is great and pressing work for theological speculation to do; for it would be mere self-deception to flatter ourselves that Christianity is yet done with this immense new phenomenon. The real apologetic of our age will be the Church's deliberate judgment on Darwinism.

This, however, is still to come. Our great apologetic books, such as Butler and Paley, were written before the movement of which evolution is the outcome had set in. They are still used in our colleges and are useful in their way; but they help us little with the problems of the present time. They come from an age which was agitated with different questions; they were written by men who had mastered the thought of their own time, and were able to give the Christian judgment upon it; but there is

new work
men are

It will
in the fir
which D
criticism
ly little
with by
The Chu
it is true
body of
way the
there is
tric thes
Homo, i
that the
may be
ception
the uni
for whic
larger a
Christia
to be
more
which
fessor
Spiritu
and en
in this
of a gr
But
Christ
its chi
time
again
philos
begin
If the
germ
alent
sense
carry
there
gust
the i
to be
the
of f
lievi
Min
feel
less
man
wit
on

to
ch

new work to be done in our time, and new men are needed to do it.

It will be necessary for Christian thought, in the first place, to master the facts for which Darwinism is a general name. Mere criticism from the outside is of comparatively little use; Darwinism can only be dealt with by one who knows it from within. The Church will have to find out how far it is true, and work this new truth into the body of her own convictions. On this pathway there lie great gains before her; for there is some truth in the apparently eccentric thesis maintained by the author of *Ecce Homo*, in his book on *Natural Religion*, that the Unknown Cause of the agnostic may be a greater and more impressive conception than the Christian's God, because the universe of the scientist's imagination, for which it accounts, is in some cases a larger and grander one than that of the Christian. Our conceptions of God require to be incessantly refreshed by truer and more extended views of the universe of which He is the cause. A book like Professor Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* is a specimen of the novel and enriching truths which may be gathered in this inquiry, and it is only the first-fruits of a great harvest.

But, however large be the gifts which Christianity may receive from Darwinism, its chief work in regard to it will be, for a time at all events, the reassertion over against it of the principles of a spiritual philosophy. Mind is not the end, but the beginning, of the evolution of the universe. If there has been an evolution from primeval germs, there must first have been an equivalent involution. If the observation of the senses and the activity of the understanding carry us back to the beginning of evolution, there are powers of the mind still more august which irresistibly carry us farther. If the impressions made on the senses lead us to believe in the existence of material things, the impressions made on a still higher range of faculties give us the like reason for believing in a higher realm of existence. Minds absorbed with material things may feel these impressions from the higher realm less and less; but they are the glory of human nature, and in its ultimate reckoning with Darwinism the mind of man will insist on giving them their legitimate place.

II.

The second topic to be named may be said to have been thrown to the surface by chance, in the course of the digging which

has taken place about evolution. Although the scientific movement of the age is called evolution—that is, a progress forward and upward from the germs of things to their developed forms—the method of investigation has really been in the opposite direction, from the world as we now see it back through antecedent forms to the beginning. It has really been a revival of history—history being taken in its widest sense, as embracing the past of animals, plants and minerals as well as the past of man. Only the records of the civilised races were formerly dignified with the name of history; but, under the impulse of the new ideas, research has thrown itself with peculiar ardour on the obscure beginnings of civilisation and on the conditions of life anterior to civilisation. Language and folk-lore, customs and institutions, have been traced back to the remotest past, where the light of human life begins to glimmer out of the great darkness.

Now one thing which this searching investigation of the history of man has disclosed is the universal prevalence of religion. Religion is found to have been always the most influential factor in human life. It is now proved, with a force of evidence never before available, that man is a religious animal. Accordingly there has arisen a science concerning itself with this department of human life—the science of religions or COMPARATIVE RELIGION. It separates from one another the religions of the world, arranging them in the order of development; it specifies the elements which are common to them all and contrasts their differences in ritual and creed; it translates their sacred books and estimates their influence.

This is a result of modern research which, it might be thought, would be highly interesting to the spiritual mind; for the universal prevalence and profound influence of religion would appear to be a proof that religion is an indefeasible element of human nature, which, unless our nature has a lie at its heart, must have an object answering to it outside of itself. It might have been expected that the true religion would have been intensely interested in the false religions, and that Christian theology would have seized on the task of mastering their principles with peculiar avidity. This, however, has not been the case. Theology has allowed this work to be largely done by a science which is anything but theological. The study has its chief seat at present in France; and, pursued as it has been by some of the leading thinkers there, it has grown to be a formidable instrument of unbelief.

For the facts brought to light by the Science of Religions are not in all respects, at first sight at least, favourable to belief. Perhaps, indeed, to a simple faith, few experiences are more trying than a first acquaintance with another religion. Those of our countrymen who go to the East, and are brought face to face with, say, the religions of India, cannot but be struck with the resemblances between them and our own. Both have their places of worship, prayers, sacred books and ministers; and in both human hearts seem to be stirred with the same aspirations and comforted with the same hopes. The suggestion is easy, that there is no fundamental difference between them; and, as we have been taught to look upon these religions as superstitions, the conclusion may be leaped to that Christianity is only one superstition the more.

This train of reflection is one which presses on the mind with far stronger force when a wide survey is made of religions in general. As the student passes from one system to another, he is overwhelmed with unspeakable melancholy; for he is brought in contact everywhere with the tragedy of convictions for which men have been willing to sacrifice every joy and comfort of existence, and even life itself: yet the tragedy seems to be merely a comedy, for do we not hold it to be all a delusion, till Christianity is reached? But, if the human race has been so terribly mistaken in this region from the first, what likelihood is there that it is right at the last?

This is the argument against Christianity urged in *Robert Elsmere*. Widen your knowledge of the history of the race, says the authoress, acquaint yourself with other religions; and you will find that they have the same arguments with which to support themselves as Christianity: they have their miracles and their fulfilled prophecies, just as it has; but we know that in their case the evidence is of no value; in the case of Christianity it seems sound only when you isolate it from the parallel evidence for other religions: bring the two into comparison, and you will see that they have precisely the same character.

What is the answer to all this? Is it that we have been wrong in characterizing other religions absolutely as false? Although false in some respects, are they true in others? Is it the truth in them, as far as it goes, which has made them acceptable and satisfying to those who have believed them? Are they the partially true, leading up to the absolutely true, which is Christianity? Or is Christianity something

which stands wholly apart—the one way of access to God and the only means of salvation—whose glory is made the brighter by the darkness of the universal falsehood with which it is contrasted?

These are pressing questions, but they are by no means simple. If you say, "Yes, these other religions were all good in their degree; they were honest gropings of the human spirit after the Father, and gave real, though imperfect, culture to the same instincts as are nourished by Christianity," you seem to place yourself in direct antagonism to the vehemently expressed convictions of the prophets and the primitive teachers of the true religion, and with the solemn statements of the Author of this religion Himself. If, on the contrary, you answer the other way, you come into collision not only with the spirit of the age, but apparently also with that sense of sympathy and fairness which has been the light by whose guidance the best conquests of the modern intellect have been made. In short, this is a region which believing theology has still to a large extent to master, and in which there is almost boundless scope for both investigation and speculation.

III.

A third region in which there is plenty of work clamantly calling for new workers is BIBLICAL CRITICISM. The tendency of the present age to go back to the beginnings of things and sift the records of the past has naturally concentrated itself on those records which Christians believe to be the most important in existence—the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; and the instruments of criticism, which have been sharpened with use in the testing of other documents, have been applied with especial thoroughness to these.

The critical movement is the commanding phenomenon of our day in theology. The conclusions about the sacred books—their ages, authors and trustworthiness—arrived at by those who drew up the canon, and accepted for many centuries, have all been called in question; and what shape the conviction of the Church about them will assume, when it becomes fixed again, time alone can determine. To do this work lay in the course of the peculiar tendencies of our time; and it cannot be denied that the accumulation of knowledge and the possession of new methods of research have put the present age in a more advantageous position for investigating this subject than even ages which were far nearer the object of inquiry.

For a hundred years this critical process has been going on in Germany with an immense expenditure of learning and acumen. In Holland and France likewise the movement has had a long history, and, in the former country at least, has not been less thorough in its methods or less disturbing to accepted beliefs than in Germany. The Church has the most vital interest in the process; for the Word of God is the bread of life to her.

But, whilst this warfare of learned opinion has been agitating the Churches of the Continent, we in this country have kept tolerably well out of it. Though the merits of English scholarship have been high in textual criticism, comparatively little has been done here for the higher criticism. The whole process, for example, of investigation in regard to the New Testament from the rise of the Tübingen theories to their partial settlement, which has now perhaps been reached, may, without much exaggeration, be said to have transacted itself without the scholars of this country intervening at all. Our scholars have been content to hover on the outskirts of the battle, waiting to go in, when the combatants had exhausted themselves, and share the spoils.

If the struggle about the New Testament has in some degree quieted down, that about the Old Testament is at this moment in full action. In this case also we may stand by and wait till others have completed the struggle, without taking the trouble to master the learning which is needed to entitle us to have an opinion of our own. But, not to speak of the ignobleness of this position, it is an exceedingly dangerous one; because the whole subject might be sprung on us at any moment by a single man raising the questions, and we should be put to shame before the public, which looks to us as its religious instructors. This was precisely what happened when Professor Robertson Smith threw down the whole mass of Old Testament problems in the midst of the Free Church of Scotland. The Church was taken unprepared; and at last the controversy had to be closed, not by answering the questions, but by ejecting the questioner. This is not the place of course to express any opinion on the justice or wisdom of the ecclesiastical procedure; but, as a question of learning, the conclusion was eminently unsatisfactory. The subject has been flung outside the door, but at any moment it may burst its way in again; and is any of the Churches ready to deal with it?

Of course the great question in the background is the authority of Scripture; and

there are no problems, I imagine, which are perplexing the minds of students of theology more at present than those surrounding the inspiration of the Bible. Has the searching inquiry which has sifted every chapter and verse left it still possible to believe in the Bible as men used to do? Can it be maintained, for instance, that its statements can be reconciled with the ascertained facts of geology, astronomy and history? When two or more accounts of the same events are given, as in the gospels of the New Testament or the historical books of the Old, can the records be proved to agree? Is the miraculous element in the New Testament, and especially in the Old, capable in all details of successful defence? If not—if to any extent mistakes as to matters of fact are to be admitted in the Bible—how can its authority be vindicated in matters of doctrine? Is it reasonable to accept a book as the final standard of truth for faith and conduct, if you say that there are in it myths, exaggerations and mistakes? Is the Bible really “independent of criticism?” or is there a kind of criticism which is inconsistent with any real reverence for its authority?

Many will be found ready, on both sides, to answer these questions off-hand; but it is far wiser to look upon the answering of them as a task imposed by Providence on this generation, which can only be discharged by honest and patient inquiry, but may and ought to be discharged in faith, because it is His.

On the one hand, it is undeniable that the traditional and popular views about the age and origin of the various books of the Bible stand in urgent need of revision. When the light of modern research is directed on these books, facts are disclosed in great numbers with which the Church has not yet dealt. She will have to deal with them; for while theories change, facts remain. “There is scarce any truth,” says Thomas Goodwin, “but hath been tried over and over again; and still if any dross happen to mingle with it, then God calls it in question again. The Holy Ghost is so curious, so delicate, so exact, He cannot bear that any falsehood should be mingled with the truths of the gospel. This is the reason why God doth still, age after age, call former things in question, because that there is still some dross one way or other mingled with them.”

On the other hand, it is equally undeniable that the experience of other Churches and countries in dealing with these questions is well fitted to warn, and even to alarm; for it shows, that this work may be so man-

aged as to sow the fields of the Church with the salt of barrenness. We need a thoroughly independent and British study of the whole subject, done by theologians in sympathy with the best religious life of the country. Some of our most advanced thinkers in this department are as yet so dependent on German scholarship for their facts and ideas, that their writings could be broken up into sentences, and the fragments referred to the different foreign sources to which they belong. Amiel said of certain Swiss *littérateurs*, that they only poured water into the Seine; and there is a great deal of theological work being done at present in this country which is only the pouring of a few buckets into the Rhine. No past age ever had greater reason than ours to prize and revere the Scriptures; they are read more extensively than they have ever been before, and, wherever they are studied, they prove themselves the power of God. This is a conviction which our best experience has formed in us. But the very intensity and serenity with which the Church holds this conviction ought to make her address herself without delay to the frank and thorough appreciation of all the facts.

IV.

The work of criticism just described has done one thing for the Bible which may at first sight appear an evil: it has converted it from one book into a number of books. To our fathers it was a single book, from every part of which they quoted indiscriminately, as if it were a homogeneous whole; to us it is a literature, a collection of volumes of different ages and of varied character.

This breaking up of the Scripture is an evil, if it make us lose sight of the unity of the Word of God; for after all, it is truer to say that the Bible is one book than that it is a collection of books: it is one message of redeeming love to men, and among the evidences of its Divine excellence a leading place belongs to "the consent of all the parts and the scope of the whole, which is to give glory to God." But, if it be an evil, it is an evil out of which good has come; for it has given rise, within a century, to a new and most fruitful theological science.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY only became possible when it was recognised that the literature of which the Bible is composed consists of a number of strata, belonging to different ages and of different character, like the geological formation disclosed by a steep cutting. When the dates of the books are

ascertained, and they are arranged in chronological order, it undertakes to show that there is in them a gradual development of revelation, proceeding by slow and sure stages from the earliest to the latest. The older theology was partially aware of such a development from the Old Testament to the New; but this new science undertakes to exhibit it from book to book, or at least, from group to group of books, within each Testament by itself. For example, in the New Testament it distinguishes, say, four great groups of books: first, the synoptic gospels; secondly, the Petrine writings and other books of a similar character; thirdly, the Pauline epistles; and, fourthly, the Johannine writings. In each of these groups there is a complete view of Christianity, proceeding from a central idea and ramifying outwards to the circumference; and Biblical Theology undertakes to reconstruct this view from the documents. As, however, you pass from one of these circles to another, you perceive that you are passing from a simpler to a more advanced view of the subject, till, when the last is reached, the revelation is complete.

There is something intensely fascinating in this mode of study; you might almost call the science which has risen out of it the romance of theology. Perhaps it is the sense of growth which is so attractive; for in all studies this is an inspiring idea. Besides, it brings theology into line with what is the guiding principle of science at the present day. There has been evolution in revelation. God did not give the truth all at once, but "at sundry times and in divers manners." It is thus like all His other works. All God's creations grow. In the field we have first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear; and in human life there is a progress through the stages of childhood, youth, manhood and old age. The delight which we feel in watching things grow seems to be borrowed from the Divine mind itself; and the same characteristic which makes the study of nature so fascinating lends, when it is perceived, a new interest to revelation.

There are other advantages which will accrue from this fruitful line of study. It throws light on the difficulties, to which great importance has sometimes been attached, to be met with in the imperfect views of God and morality given in the earlier books of Scripture; for these would appear to be inseparable from this mode of revelation. It is rapidly putting some of the shallower systems of doctrine which have claimed scriptural sanction out of court. It

has also
Unitar
port u
deity o
texts, a
but lie
of thou
Above
it asce
of Scri
rials fo
tion th
able to
the B
which

It i
that t
noble
dred y
but to
the G
which
critici
from
the C
goes o
of the
are no
migh
result
tems
latest
too c
subje
Theo
the C
spirit
prese
for h
from

Or
likel
bibli
asce
teach
new
can
theo
thos
cove
Dog
vou
mea
awa
whi
mus
Y
don

has already, for example, made the claim of Unitarianism to any kind of scriptural support untenable; for it has shown that the deity of Christ is not only proved by isolated texts, as the older divinity was able to show, but lies at the very heart of the whole system of thought of every New Testament writer. Above all, by the thoroughness with which it ascertains the exact contents of every part of Scripture, it is accumulating the materials for a more complete and certain exhibition than the Church has ever hitherto been able to give of what the precise teaching of the Bible is on the various problems with which it deals.

It is not creditable to British theology, that those desiring to begin the study of this noble science, which has existed for a hundred years, should have scarcely any resource but to turn to text-books translated from the German, French or Dutch. The chaos which at present reigns in Old Testament criticism may, indeed, well scare scholars from the task of attempting a Theology of the Old Testament; but the toil which goes on incessantly, of writing on the books of the New Testament commentaries which are not better than those which already exist might perhaps pause for a time to allow the results of exegesis to be gathered up in systems of New Testament Theology; for the latest writer on this science has not formed too enthusiastic an estimate of his own subject when he says: "To me, Biblical Theology is the most important organ which the Church of the present, longing for new spiritual power, and the Dogmatic of the present, thirsting for new principles, possess for bringing living water out of that well from which alone it can be drawn."

V.

One of the advantages suggested above as likely to be derived from the cultivation of biblical theology is, that from the exacter ascertainment of what the Bible actually teaches the materials may be obtained for a new development of dogmatic theology. It can scarcely however be said that dogmatic theology is at present an inviting field to those who, warm with the passion for discovery, may be wishing to dig in virgin soil. Dogmatic theology had its long day of favour, and it will have it again; but in the meantime the temper of the age rather turns away from it. Perhaps the materials on which it has worked are exhausted, and it must wait till new ones accumulate.

Yet there is one portion of the dogmatic domain which, in this country at least, has

been but imperfectly cultivated, and seems at present to promise abundant returns for work which may be expended on it. I mean the field of theological or CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

In our catechisms and systems of divinity it has been usual to find a place for an exposition of the ten commandments as a summary of human duty. In some cases—as, for example, in the *Larger Catechism*—this work has been brilliant of its kind; but it has scarcely deserved to be called scientific. In fact, the exposition has generally had the appearance of a long and awkward excursus, rather than of a component part of the dogmatic system. The tendency therefore, which has manifested itself on the Continent of late, to treat Christian Ethics as a separate science, parallel with dogmatics, is a happy one; and some of the most profound and attractive books of the century are on this subject.

In this country we have a very extensive ethical literature; but as a rule it has carefully avoided the Christian or biblical standpoint. Man as an ethical being has been treated simply as a portion of nature, and the new outlooks and possibilities opened to him by revelation have been ignored. This has imported peculiar poverty and coldness into much of our ethical literature. Indeed, to pass from one of our ordinary books on moral philosophy to one of the great works on Christian Ethics produced during the present century on the Continent is like passing from the polar regions to the tropics. In the former, there is usually a careful avoidance of reference to what Christians believe to be the strongest forces working for good and evil in the world—sin, redemption, the Spirit of God, the Church; but in the latter these are the most prominent subjects. Ethical work of great value has recently been done by our native thinkers on questions which belong to the prolegomena of the science; but one does not know where in our literature to look for a system of ethics such as one imagines possible, in which the whole of human life should be pictured forth in grandeur and repose, like a rich and varied landscape seen from a mountain top, with a man's own pathway from time to eternity lying clearly indicated through the midst of it.

The thorough philosophical training which our students receive, and the enthusiasm for philosophy which at present prevails in our universities, ought to make a new development in this direction easy. Many of those who enter the ministry of our Churches have been distinguished in the philosophical classes, and it is surprising

that so few of them afterwards produce anything in the line of their academic attainments. The reason seems to be, that they have not courage enough to forsake the beaten path of ethical discussion and strike into pathways of inquiry more akin to the work of their own office.

These are perhaps the most pressing of the tasks which theology has at present to face; and it will be acknowledged that they present work enough to even the keenest and most aspiring minds. To timid minds, indeed, the description of them may be discouraging. If, it may be asked, so many things are unsettled, is a man justified in going forward to preach the gospel, before the difficulties have been cleared away? When reading the history of our own country in times of conflict, such, for example, as the period of the Napoleonic wars, a reader may become so absorbed in campaigns and sieges, fields of battle and fights at sea, as to have the impression that during those years all England must have been standing on tiptoe, watching with straining eyes and beating heart to see what was to be the issue of the conflict which imperilled her existence. But it will surprise him, upon making a closer acquaintance with the history of the period, to discover that during these years, on the island "ribbed and paled in with rocks unscalable and roaring waters," life was going on much as usual: the fields were tilled and the harvests reaped; spring with its freshness and summer with its glory gladdened the land; the mill-wheel went round, the hammer rang on the anvil, and the shuttle flew through the web; men slept and woke and ate their daily bread; children were born, lovers married, and widows wept; nor were laughter and merriment much less loud than usual; the various life of a great and happy people went on from day to day. In the same way, the warfare with unbelief is at present loud and far-extended, and sometimes the problems of the day will seem to us, as we study them, to be so momentous, that we think everything ought to stop till they are settled. But Christianity is not a country which still needs to be discovered. It is a home of human souls, wide, well known and intensely loved, from whose soil a hundred generations have been nourished; and, though there is at present pressing work in theology for the soldier-thinker to do, who marches to the borders to defend the faith against the inroads of scepticism, and for the pioneer-thinker, who goes in search of lands in which belief may find new dwell-

ings, yet to cultivate the fields of the old home as faithful husbandmen, that its children may not lack their food, but grow up in spiritual health and strength, will ever be the main work of the Christian ministry.

THE IMPREGNABLE ROCK OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *Good Words*, London, April, 1890.

It is a serious question how far one ignorant, like myself, of Hebrew, and having no regular practice in the study and explanation of the text of the Old Testament, is entitled to attempt representations concerning it, which must present more or less the character of advice, to any portion of his fellow-countrymen. It is clear that he can draw no sufficient warrant for such a course from the mere warmth of his desire that such portion of the British public should not lose or relax their hold upon the Book which Christendom regards as an inestimable treasure, and thereby bring upon themselves, as well as others, an inexpressible calamity. But, on the other hand, he has some better pleas to urge. The first is that there is a very large portion of the community whose opportunities of judgment have been materially smaller than his own. The second is that though he is greatly wanting in the valuable qualifications growing out of special study in this field, he has, for more than forty years (believing that change of labour is to a great extent the healthiest form of recreation), devoted the larger part of all such time as he could properly withdraw from political duties to another, and in several respects a similar, field of specialism—namely, the earnest study of prehistoric antiquity and of its documents in regard to the Greek race, whose destinies have been, after those of the Hebrews, the most wonderful in themselves, and the most fertile of results for us, among all the races of mankind. As between this field, which has for its central point the study of Homer, and that of the early Scriptures, which may in the mass be roughly called contemporary with the Homeric period, much light is, and with the progress of research more can hardly fail to be, given and received. Moreover, I have there had the opportunity of perceiving how, among specialists as with other men, there may be fashions of the time and school, which Lord Bacon called idols of the market-place, and currents of

prejud
tract s
each i
field, a
conclu
artist
not an
derive
lights
and th
specia
that h
sourc
sies f
feel s
have
were
impor
grant
or de
ancie
he ca
spect
the b
ly as
the t
may
with
Script
Th
And
but
pose
Script
histo
them
and
done
with
cont
cont
to r
show
such
know
whi
mat
we
may
diff
doc
the
ma
offi
in
thi
I
mo
the
tar
op

prejudice below the surface, which may detract somewhat from the authority which each inquirer may justly claim in his own field, and from their title to impose their conclusions upon mankind. As a judicious artist likes to know the opinion even of one not an expert on his picture, and sometimes derives benefit from it, so in all studies lights may be thrown inwards from without; and this in far the largest degree where the special study deals with a subject-matter that has deep root in our nature, and is the source of profoundly interesting controversies for mankind at large. Yet I do not feel sure that these considerations would have led me to make the present attempt were they not capped with another of great importance. It appears to me that we may grant, for argument's sake, to the negative or destructive specialist in the field of the ancient Scriptures all which as a specialist he can by possibility be entitled to ask respecting the age, text, and authorship of the books, and yet may hold firmly, as firmly as of old, to the ideas justly conveyed by the title I have adopted for this paper, and may invite our fellow-men to stand along with us on "the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture."

These words sound like a challenge. And they are a challenge to some extent, but not in the sense that might be supposed. They are a challenge to accept the Scriptures on the moral and spiritual and historical ground of their characters in themselves, and of the work which they, and the agencies associated with them, have done and are doing in the world. We may, without touching the domain of the critic, contend for them as corresponding by their contents to the idea of a Divine revelation to man. We are entitled to attempt to show that they afford that kind of proof of such a revelation which is analogous to the known divine operations in other spheres; which binds to conduct; and which in other matters, inasmuch as we are rational beings, we recognise as entitled so to bind us. We may legitimately ask whether they do not differ in such a manner from the other documents of prehistoric religions, while they too are precious in various ways, as to make them witnesses and buttresses to the office of Holy Scripture rather than sharers in it, although in their degree they may be this also.

But all these assertions lie within the moral and spiritual precinct. No one of them begs any literary question of Old Testament criticism. They leave absolutely open every issue that has been or can be

raised respecting the origin, date, authorship and text of the sacred books, which for the present purpose we do not require even to call sacred. Indeed it may be that this destructive criticism, if entirely made good, would, in the view of an inquiry really searching, comprehensive, and philosophical, leave as its result not less but greater reason for admiring the hidden modes by which the great Artificer works out His designs. In proportion as the means are feeble, perplexed, and to all appearance confused, is the marvel of the results that stand before our eyes. And the upshot may come to be, that, on this very ground we may have to cry out with the Psalmist* absorbed in worshipping admiration, "Oh, that men would therefore praise the Lord for His goodness, and declare the wonders that He doeth for the children of men!" Or "How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out." For the memories of men, and the art of writing, and the care of the copyist, and the tablet and the rolls of parchment, are but the secondary or mechanical means by which the Word has been carried down to us along the river of the ages; and the natural and inherent weakness of these means is but a special tribute to the grandeur and greatness of the end, and of Him that wrought it out.

So, then, these high-sounding words have been placed in the foreground of the present observations, because they convey in a positive and definite manner the conclusion which the observations themselves aim at sustaining, at least in outline, on general grounds of reason, and at enforcing as a great rule of thought and life. They lead upwards and onwards to the idea that the Scriptures are well called Holy Scriptures; and that, though assailed by camp, by battery, and by mine, they are nevertheless a house builded upon a rock, and that rock impregnable; that the weapon of offence, which shall impair their efficiency for practical purposes, has not yet been forged; that the sacred Canon, which it took (perhaps) two thousand years from the accumulations of Moses down to the acceptance of the Apocalypse to construct, is like to wear out the storms and the sunshine, and all the wayward aberrations of humanity, not merely for a term as long, but until time shall be no more.

And yet, upon the very threshold, I embrace, in what I think a substantial sense, one of the great canons of modern criticism,

* Ps. cvii. 8.

which teaches us that the Scriptures are to be treated like any other book in the trial of their title. The volume which is put into our hands when young under that venerated name, is, like any other volume, put together as a material object by human hands. The many and diversified utterances it contains proceeded from men; and the question, whether through supernatural guidance they were, for this purpose, more than men, is to be determined, like other disputable questions, by the evidence. The books have been transmitted to us from their formation onwards in perishable materials, and from remote dates; and, until four hundred years ago, by the agency of copyists, as in the case of other literary productions, and presumably with a like liability to error. That in some sense the Holy Scriptures contain something of a human element is clear, as to the New Testament, from diversities of reading, from slight conflicts in the narrative, and from an insignificant number of doubtful cases as to the authenticity of the text. We have also the Latin Vulgate partially competing with the Greek original on the ground that it has been more or less founded on manuscripts older than any we now possess. As regards the Old Testament, we find the established Hebrew text to be of a date not earlier than I believe the tenth century of our era, and to be at variance in many points with the Greek version, commonly termed the Septuagint, which is considered to date wholly or in part from the third century before the Advent of our Saviour. Thus the accuracy of the text, the age and authorship of the books, open up a vast field of purely literary controversy, and such a question as whether the closing verses of St. Mark's Gospel have the authority of Scripture must be determined by literary evidence as much as the genuineness of the pretended preface to the *Æneid* or of a particular stanza in *Catullus*.

Towards summing up these observations, I will remind the reader that those who believe in a Divine Revelation, as pervading or as contained in the Scriptures, and especially who accept the doctrine of literalism as to the vehicle of that inspiration, have to lay their account with the following (among other) considerations, which it is hard for them to repudiate as inadmissible. There may possibly have been—

1. Imperfect comprehension of that which was communicated :
2. Imperfect expression of what had been comprehended :
3. Lapse of memory in oral transmission :

4. Errors of copyists in written transmission :

5. Changes with the lapse of time in the sense of words :

6. Variations arising from renderings into different tongues, especially as between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint, which was probably based upon MS. older than the compilers of the Hebrew text could have had at their command :

7. That there are three variant chronologies of the Old Testament according to the Hebrew, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch, and that it would be hazardous to claim for any one of them the sanction of a Divine revelation : while an historical argument may be deducible, on the other hand, from the fact that their variations lie within certain limits.

No doubt there will be those who will resent any association between the idea of a Divine revelation and the possibility of even the smallest intrusion of error in its vehicle. But ought they not to bear in mind that we are bound by the rule of reason to look for the same method of procedure in this great matter of a special provision of Divine knowledge for our needs as in the other parts of the manifold dispensation under which Providence has placed us. Now that method or principle is one of sufficiency, not perfection; of sufficiency for the attainment of practical ends, not of conformity to ideal standards. Bishop Butler, I think, would wisely tell us that we are not the judges, and that we are quite unfit to be the judges, what may be the proper amount and the just conditions of any of the aids to be afforded us in passing through the discipline of life. I will only remark that this default of ideal perfection, this use of twilight instead of a noonday blaze, may be adapted to our weakness, and may be among the appointed means of exercising our faith. But what belongs to the present occasion is to point out that if probability, and not demonstration, marks the Divine guidance of our paths in life as a whole, we are not entitled to require that when the Almighty, in His mercy, makes a special addition by revelation to what He has already given to us of knowledge in Nature and in Providence, that special gift should be unlike His other gifts, and should have all its lines and limits drawn out with mathematical precision.

I have then admitted, I hope in terms of sufficient fulness, that my aim in no way embraces a controversy with the moderate or even the extreme developments of textual criticism. Dr. Driver, the Regius Profes-

son of Hebrew at Oxford,* personally as well as officially a champion of the doctrine that there is a Divine revelation, has recently shown with great clearness and ability that the basis of that criticism is sound and undeniable. It compares consistencies and inconsistencies of text, not simply as would be done by an ordinary reader, but with all the lights of collateral knowledge. It pronounces on the meaning of terms with the authority derived from thorough acquaintance with a given tongue. It investigates and applies those laws of growth which apply to language as they apply to a physical organism.

It has long been known, for example, that portions of the historical books of the Old Testament, such as the Books of Chronicles, were of a date very far later than most of the events which they record, and that a portion of the prophecies included in the Book of Isaiah were later than his time. We are now taught that, according to the prevailing judgment of the learned, the form in which the older books of the Old Testament have come down to us does not correspond as a rule with their titles, and is due to later though still, as is largely held, to remote periods; and that the law presented to us in the Pentateuch is not an enactment of a single date but has been formed by a process of growth, and by gradual accretions. To us who are without original means of judgment these are, at first hearing, without doubt, disturbing announcements. Yet common sense requires us to say, let them be fought out by the competent, but let not us who are incompetent interfere. I utterly, then, eschew conflict with these properly critical conclusions.

But this acquiescence is subject to the following remarks. First, the acceptance of the conclusions of the critics has reference to the literary form of the works, and leaves entirely open every question relating to the substance. Any one who reads the books of the Pentateuch, from the second to the fifth, must observe how little they present the appearance of consecutive, coherent, and digested record; but their several portions must be considered on the evidence applicable to them respectively, and the main facts of the history they contain have received strong confirmation from Egyptian and Eastern research. With regard to the Book of Genesis, the admission which has been made implies nothing adverse to the truth of the traditions it em-

bodies, nothing adverse to their antiquity, nothing which excludes or discredits the idea of their having formed part of a primitive revelation, simultaneous or successive. The forms of expression may have changed yet the substance may remain with an altered literary form, as some scholars have thought (not, I believe, rightly) that the diction and modelling of the Homeric Poems is comparatively modern, and yet the matter they embody may belong to a remote antiquity.

Further, our assent to the conclusions of the critics ought to be strictly limited to a provisional and revocable assent; and this on practical grounds of stringent obligation. For, firstly, these conclusions appear to be in a great measure floating and uncertain, the subject of manifold controversy, and secondly they seem to shift and vary with rapidity in the minds of those who hold them. In editing and revising the work of Bleek,* Wellhausen accepts in a great degree the genuineness of the Davidic Psalms contained in the First Book of the Psalter. But I understand that this position has been abandoned, and that, standing as he appears to do at the head of the negative critics, he brings down the general body of the Psalms to a date very greatly below that of the Babylonian exile. It is certainly unreasonable to hold a critic to his conclusions without exception. But, on the other hand, it may be asked whether they ought not to contain some element of stability? The opening of new sources of information may justify all changes fairly referable to them; and in minor matters the fine touches of the destructive, as well as the constructive, artist may complete his work. But if reasonable grounds for change do not determine its limits, there must be limits on the other hand to the duty of deference and submission on the part of the outer and uninstructed world with respect to these literary conclusions. The most liberal estimate can hardly carry them farther than this, that we should keep an open mind till the cycle of change has been run through, and till time has been given for the hearing of those whose researches may have led them to different results.

In the present instance we have an example which may not be without force in support of this warning. Mr. Margoliouth, the Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, and a gentleman of academical distinctions

* "Einleitung in das Alte Testament." Haupttheil I., C. Die Psalmen. [The edition published and adopted by Wellhausen, to which I refer, is (I think) dated 1870; but the book had been published in 1860.]

altogether extraordinary, has published his Inaugural Lecture,* in which he states his belief that, from materials and by means which he lucidly explains, it will be found possible to reconstruct the Semitic original, hitherto unknown, of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. It was written, he states, by Ben Sira, not in the Hebrew of the Prophets, but in the later Hebrew of the Rabbis (p. 6). I understand that there are three great stages, or states, of the Hebrew tongue—the Ancient, the Middle, and the New; and that of these the earlier or classical Scriptures belong to the first, and the Book of Nehemiah (for example), to the second. The third is the Rabbinical stage. The passage from one to another of these stages is held, under the laws of that language, to require a very long time. Professor Margoliouth finds that Ben Sira wrote in Rabbinical Hebrew, and the earlier we find Rabbinical Hebrew in use, the farther we drive into antiquity the dates of books written in middle and in ancient Hebrew. Suppose, by way of illustration, that Professor Margoliouth shows Rabbinical Hebrew to have come into use two hundred years earlier than had been supposed, the effect is to throw back by two hundred years the latest date to which a book in middle or in ancient Hebrew could be assigned. No wonder, then, that Professor Margoliouth observes (p. 22)—

"Some students are engaged in bringing down the date of every chapter in the Bible so late as to leave no room for prophecy and revelation."

But he goes on to add that if, by the task which he has undertaken, and by those who may follow and improve upon him, this Book shall be properly restored,

"Others will endeavour to find out how early the professedly post-exilic books can be put back, so as to account for the divergence between their awkward Middle-Hebrew and the rich and eloquent New-Hebrew of Ben Sira. However this may be, hypotheses which place any portion of the classical or Old-Hebrew Scriptures between the Middle-Hebrew of Nehemiah and the New-Hebrew of Ben Sira will surely require some reconsideration, or at least have to be harmonized in some way with the history of the language, before they can be unconditionally accepted."

Hence the spectator from without, perceiving that there is war, waged on critical grounds, in the critical camp, may surmise that what has been wittily called the order

of disorder is more or less menaced in its central seat; and he may be the more hardened in his determination not to rush prematurely to final conclusions on the serious, though not as I suppose vital, question respecting the age and authenticity of the early books of the Old Testament in their present literary form.

There is such a thing as mistaking the indifferent for the essential, and as a slavish adherence to traditions insufficiently examined. But the liabilities of human nature to error do not all lie on one side. It may on the contrary be stated with some confidence that when error in a certain direction after a long precedence is effectively called to account, it is generally apt, and in some cases certain, to be followed by a reign of prejudices or biased judgments more or less extended and in a contrary direction. There is such a thing as a bias in favour of disintegration. Often does a critic bring to the book he examines the conclusion which he believes that he has drawn from it. Often when he has not thus imported it, yet the first view, in remote perspective, of the proposition to which he leans will induce him to rush at the most formidable fences that lie ahead of him, instead of taking his chances of arriving at it by the common road of reason. And often, even when he has attained it without prejudice, he will after adopting defend it against objectors, not with argument only, but with all the pride and pain of wounded self-love. And every one of these dangers is commonly enhanced in the same proportion in which the particular subject matter embraces the highest interests of mankind.

What I would specially press upon those to whom I write is that they should look broadly and largely at the subject of Holy Scripture, especially of the Scriptures of the older dispensation, which are, so to speak, farther from the eye, and should never allow themselves to be won away from that broad and large contemplation into discussions which, though in their own place legitimate, nay, needful, yet are secondary, and therefore, when substituted for the primary, are worse than frivolous. I do not ask this from them as philosophers or as Christians, but as men of sense. I ask them to look at the subject as they would look at the British Constitution, or at the poetry of Shakespeare. If we were pressed by the apparent absurdity that any one branch of the British Legislature can stop the proceedings of the whole, or that the House of Commons can reduce to beggary the whole Army, Navy, and Civil Service

* "On the place of Ecclesiasticus in Semitic Literature." Clarendon Press, 1890.

of the country, and that neither law nor usage make any provision for meeting the case, though there would ensue nothing less than a frustration of the purposes for which men join together in society, there are probably not ten men in the country whose estimate of the Constitution they live under would be affected by these supererogatory objections. And if we are in any measure to grasp the office, dignity, and authority of the Scriptures, we must not suppose we are dealing adequately with that lofty subject by exhausting thought and time in examining whether Moses edited or wrote the Pentateuch as it stands, or what was the book of the law found in the temple in the times of Josiah, or whether it is possible or likely that changes of addition or omission may have crept into the text. If the most greedily destructive among all the theories of the modern critics (so seriously at variance with one another) were established as true, it would not avail to impair the great facts of the history of man with respect to the Jews and to the nations of the world; nor to disguise the light which those facts throw upon the pages of the Sacred Volume; nor to abate the commanding force with which, bathed, so to speak, in the flood of that light, the Bible invites, attracts, and commands the adhesion of mankind. Even the moral problems, which may be raised as to particular portions of the volume, and which may not have found any absolute and certain solution, are lost in the comprehensive contemplation of its general strain, its immeasurable loftiness of aim, and the vastness of the results which it and its immediate accompaniments in institution and event have wrought for our predecessors in the journey of life, for ourselves, and for the most forward, dominant, and responsible portions of our race.

In a passage which rises to the very highest level of British eloquence, Dr. Liddon,* exhausting all the resources of our language, has described, so far as man may describe it, the ineffable and unapproachable position held by the Sacred Volume. It is too long to quote, too special to appropriate; and to make extracts would only mangle it. The commanding eminence of the great preacher of our metropolitan Cathedral will fasten the public attention on the subject, and powerfully serve to show that the Scriptures, in their substantial tissue, rise far above the region of criticism, which can do nothing permanent or effectual to lower

their moral and spiritual grandeur, or to disguise or intercept their gigantic work.

The impression prevails that in this and other countries the operative classes, as they are termed, have at the great centres of population, here and elsewhere, largely lost their hold upon the Christian creed. There may be exaggeration in this belief; but, all things taken together, there is evidently a degree of foundation for it. It does not mean, at least among us, that they have lost respect for the Christian religion, or for its ministers; or that they desire their children to be brought up otherwise than in the knowledge and practice of it; or that they themselves have snapped the last ties which, on the cardinal occasions of existence, associate them with its ordinances; or that they have renounced or modified the moral standards of conduct which its conspicuous victory, after an obstinate contest of many centuries, and its long possession of the social field, have established. It means no more and no less than this, that their positive, distinct acceptance of the articles of the Creed, and their sense of the dignity and value of the Sacred Record, are blunted or effaced.

In passing I may be permitted to observe that the assent thus more or less largely withheld by the less well-to-do segment of society is still, notwithstanding the sceptical movement of the day, very generally yielded by the leisured and better provided classes. There seems to be within certain limits some approach to a reversal of the respective attitudes which prevailed in the infancy of our religion. Then the "poor" were the principal objects of the personal ministry of Christ Our Lord, and it was their glory to be the readiest receivers of the Gospel. They were then, "the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him."* They had fewer obstacles, especially within themselves, to prevent their accepting the new religion. It was less hard for them to become "as little children." They had by contrast more palpable interests in the promise of the life to come, as compared with the possession of the life that now is. The apparent change in their comparative facility of access to the Saviour as respects belief is one to afford much matter for meditation. The present purpose is to deal, in slight outline at least, with one of its causes. I mean the wide disparagement of the Holy Scriptures recently observable in the surface currents

* Sermon preached at St. Paul's on the Second Sunday in Advent, Dec. 1889; pp. 28-31.

* James ii. 5.

of prevalent opinion, as regards their title to supply in a supreme degree food for the religious thought of man, and authoritative guidance for his life.

Amongst the suppositions which tend to produce this disparagement are the following :—

I. That the conclusions of science as to natural objects have shaken or destroyed the assertions of the early Scriptures with respect to the origin and history of the world and of man, its principal inhabitant.

II. That their contents are in many cases offensive to the moral sense, and unworthy of an enlightened age.

III. That man made his appearance in the world in a condition but one degree above that of the brute creation, and by slow and painful but continual progress has brought himself up to the present level of his existence.

IV. That he has accomplished this by the exercise of his natural powers, and has never received the special teaching and authoritative guidance which is signified under the name of Divine Revelation.

V. That the more considerable among the different races and nations of the world have established from time to time their respective religions, and have in many cases accepted the promulgation of sacred books, which are to be considered as essentially of the same character with the Bible.

VI. That the books of the Bible, in many most important instances, and especially those books of the Old Testament which purport to be the earliest, so far from being contemporary with the events which they record, or with the authors to whom they are ascribed, are comparatively recent compilations from uncertain sources, and therefore without authority. To this assumption most of the foregoing remarks refer.

There are propositions wider still, but wholly foreign to the present purpose—such as that God is essentially unknowable, that we have no reasonable evidence of a life beyond the grave, and that rational certainty is confined to material objects and to the testimony of the senses. Passing by these propositions, I confine myself wholly to what preceded them, and I shall endeavour, from some points of view, to present an opposing view of the spiritual field. Moreover, as each of these is the subject of a literature of its own which may be termed scientific, I here premise that what I have to say will, though I hope rational and true, be not systematic or complete, but popular and partial only, and will have for its immediate aim to show that there are grave

reasons for questioning every destructive proposition, and for withholding our assent from them until these reasons (and, as I conceive, many others) shall be confuted and set aside.

I shall, however, as being in duty bound to follow the truth so far as I can discern it, have to make many confessions in the course of my argument to the prejudice, not as I trust of Christian belief or of the Sacred Volume, but only of us, who as its students have failed gravely and at many points in the duty of a temperate and cautious treatment of it, as unhappily we have also failed in every other duty. But, as the lines and laws of duty at large remain unobscured, notwithstanding the imperfections everywhere diffused, so we may trust that sufficient light yet remains for us if duly followed whereby to establish the authority and sufficiency of Holy Scripture for its high moral and spiritual purposes. For the present, I have endeavoured to point out that the operations of criticism properly so called, affecting as they do the literary form of the books, leave the questions of history, miracle, revelation substantially where they found them. I shall in several succeeding papers strive to show, at least by specimens, that science and research have done much to sustain the historical credit of the Old Testament; that in doing this they have added strength to the argument which contends that in them we find a Divine revelation; and that the evidence, rationally viewed, both of contents and of results, binds us to stand where our forefathers have stood, upon the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture.

THE LEADING PROBLEMS OF NEW TESTAMENT DISCUSSION.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D., CAPITAL UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, O.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, March 22, 1890.

SINCE the disappearance of the Tübingen school from the arena of technical Bible controversy, the Old rather than the New Testament has been the cynosure of all eyes. Wellhausen's transfer of the Levitical system from the beginning to the end of the Old Testament religious development, and the adoption of this reconstruction of the sources for a revolutionary conception of the origin and character of this religion by Kuenen and others, quite naturally made the records of the old covenant the great

debatable ground on which this new phase of the never-ending struggle between historic faith and unfaith unfolded itself. The researches and discussions in the New Testament department have, during this last decade or two, been going on all the same. They have, however, been confined more to the circles of specialists and scholars, and have not gained the public prominence which the Old Testament controversies secured for themselves so rapidly.

In principle, the mooted problems in both spheres have practically been and are yet identical, involving in their innermost kernel the question as to factors and forces that entered into that development of which the biblical books are the official documents. In both, the traditional views of the Church must contend against a more or less naturalizing or even naturalistic interpretation of these. The new religious thought of the age is, to use an expression of the veteran Delitzsch, a constant tendency toward a religion of the era of Darwin.

The final end and aim of all Bible study is the interpretation of the text of the sacred records, both as to the individual import of the separate passages, sections, or books, and as to the bearing of these on the character of the Bible religions. Preparatory to this exegetical process are the disciplines of lower and higher criticism. The former has the object of securing, as near as possible, the very words penned by the holy writers; the latter, of bringing the circumstances of time, occasion, author, and other surroundings that gave shape and form to the original composition, to bear upon the elucidation of their original meaning and intent. In the New Testament department, investigators have been able to preserve the logical order of these processes much better than has been done in regard to the Old. In the latter, the questions of higher criticism, in so far as these pertain to such purely literary phases as composition and date, have been answered in a manner acceptable to a majority of those who believe in the legitimacy of modern critical principles;* but, at the same time, the textual or lower criticism is still in a chaotic condition. The preliminary considerations of critical aids, such as the value of the Septuagint, and of the method and manner of applying the principles of the science, by no means enjoy a general consensus. In the New Testament field, the textual criticism is practically settled; and, owing

chiefly to the labors of such men as Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, and Hort, we have practically a *textus receptus*, based not upon accidental readings or immature combinations, but upon an almost exhaustive collection of the data and a rigid application of correct literary criticism.

But in the domain of higher criticism the New Testament has not fared so well. Here even in leading literary questions nothing like the agreement has been reached to which Old Testament scholars have attained in regard to the composite parts of the Pentateuch and similar points. The recent investigations of such men as Holtzmann, Weiss, Weiszäcker, Harnack, Pfleiderer, and others, emphasize anew that the seeming harmony of ten years ago does not actually exist. Not on the synoptic problem, nor on the composition and authenticity of the Acts or the Apocalypse, and now scarcely on the four great Pauline epistles, which the Tübingen school left intact, is there a general agreement.

Of course, in kind the literary problems of the New Testament do not differ materially from those of the Old. The object in both is such an adjustment of the records that they present the actual historic process of the origin and development of the New Testament religion. And yet in details these problems differ in not a little degree. The same fundamental importance which the Pentateuchal riddle has for the Old Testament the synoptic problem has for the New. And yet they are of character by no means identical. Indeed, in the whole New Testament there exists no literary problem similar to that of the Pentateuchal analysis, except perhaps in the case of the Acts, where the source and value of the "we" sections are in great dispute; or that of the Apocalypse, the composite character of which is at present a favorite hypothesis, particularly the view that it is a Jewish apocalypse revised and enlarged by a Christian writer.

The synoptic problem deals with the literary origin of the first three Gospels. Their agreements are so many that they cannot have been written without some connection with each other, or with some other source common to all of them; and, on the other hand, their disagreements are so many that they must, to a greater or less extent, be independent productions. In one respect, a general consensus has been reached; namely, that not one of the Gospels, in its present shape, can be considered as the basis of the other two, but that they all have come from a common source, which may have been a written document,—in

* It is, of course, not to be understood, by this remark, that there is practical agreement among a majority of Higher Critics as to the date of each and every book of the Old Testament.—THE EDITOR, *Sunday-School Times*.

which case it was in the Aramaic language, —or it was an oral gospel, preserving the story of the Lord's words and doings.

The majority of scholars accept the first alternative, but with a divergency as to character and contents of this original gospel, and the relations of the present gospel to this, the two clans being respectively headed by Weiss and Holtzmann. The whole view is based chiefly upon the statement of Papias of the early existence of a collection of "Logia," or sayings of the Lord. The conditions for peace and agreement in this literary question seem to be wanting. Pastor Primarius Resch, who has recently, by his publication of the "Agrapha," or the un- and extra-canonical sayings of the Lord ascribed to him by patristic literature, introduced a new element into the vexed question, very properly calls the synoptic problem a battle-field where the contestants are for the time resting on their arms, unable to terminate the struggle.

"The golden ring" of Pauline Epistles, as Harnack recently called the four uncontested epistles of Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, is now not without its opposition, although this has not developed material strength. On the other hand, the Johannean authorship of the fourth Gospel has been gaining in defenders from year to year, the number of those who see in it the religious reflections and dogmatic speculations of a later age is constantly becoming fewer. The attacks on the Pauline authorship of the pastoral letters, and, to a measure, on the other Epistles not in "the golden ring," have not ceased; but their defence in the name of fair criticism has grown extensively and intensively. The greatest doubts seem yet to exist in regard to one or more of the general Epistles.

The superstructure which is reared on the foundation of this criticism of the sources is in accordance with the premises. While the Tübingen views have no pure representatives, the general character of the theories concerning the origin and character of original Christianity, in so far as these theories differ from the commonly accepted views of conservative scholars, agree in maintaining that in later Christianity, as found depicted in the New Testament records, elements were introduced that sprang from sources other than the Founder of this religion and his authorized ambassadors. A favorite view at present is this, that Greek thought and philosophy modified primitive Christianity, not only formally, but also materially, thus diverting the development from its original lines. On the whole, the radicalism

in this regard is probably not as strong as it is in the new construction of the Old Testament religion by the Wellhausen-Kuenen school, but the trend is the same; namely, the reduction of the divine element in both the contents and the composition of the biblical books to as small a measure as possible. In harmony with the general thought of the day, the tendencies in advanced thought are here too toward naturalism.

SHORT-CUT AND CROSS-CUT.

BY JAMES W. WILLMARTH, D.D.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, March 27, 1890.

THE opening in Minneapolis and Boston of what are commonly known as "short-cut" schools, raises some questions of very grave importance to the Baptist denomination.

If the sole purpose of these schools were to fit laymen for usefulness as pastors' assistants, colporteurs, lay workers in city missions, etc., and also as helpers (where needed) to foreign missionaries, that would be one thing; and whether the plan should prove to be wise or unwise, no very serious issues would be involved. But if the purpose is to prepare men by this "short-cut" for the work of the ministry, at home or abroad or both, then that is a very different matter.

THE "SHORT-CUT" TO THE MINISTRY.

We are not permitted to believe that the "short-cut" schools, now under consideration, are intended only for the benefit of laymen who will not aspire to the ministry. Dr. Gordon entitles his recent article, "Who may preach?" In seeking shelter under the illustrious and venerable name of Francis Wayland, he quotes from that great man's writings on the ministry and on preparation for the ministry. The avowed purpose of the Boston school is to "encourage" persons of "only a very limited education to enter missionary service." Dr. Mabie, whom I highly esteem, in setting forth the claims of the Minneapolis school, broadens the scope of this new departure so as to include "the evangelization of the new Northwest," and the supply of preaching to "mission churches" there. These schools, then, are designed, beyond all questions, as an essential and dominant part of their work, to open and make easy a "short-cut" into the ministry, *i.e.*, to encourage

and aid men to become preachers of the gospel and (in some cases, at least) pastors of churches without thorough training. And more than this, it is proposed to take "working men," "men without classical or theological education," and after a "simple and practical course of instruction," which, in the nature of the case, must be very "simple" indeed, and almost entirely "practical," to send them forth as foreign and home missionaries. So that we are face to face with this question: Is this policy called for in the providence of God, wise, timely, and free from serious danger?

In considering the question now at issue let us endeavor to know exactly and definitely what it is. And so let us first name certain things which are not in question, and which ought not to be represented as in question, or as involved in this new issue.

THINGS NOT IN QUESTION.

1. It is not in question that laymen have a work to do for Christ, and should in some way be taught to do that work efficiently. I know of no Baptist who doubts as to this.

2. It is not in question that true ministers are called to their work by the Holy Spirit. I am surprised that a man so highly esteemed by us all for piety, ability, and candor as Dr. Gordon, should allow himself to represent that it is otherwise. Dr. Bright, Dr. Johnson, every other Baptist, believes in a divine call to the ministry as much as he does. It is a distinguishing tenet of our denomination. At the same time it is necessary to guard against abuses of this doctrine. The call must be witnessed not only by the man's own "consciousness," but (in ordinary cases) by that of his brethren. If they are not convinced that he is called, he may properly conclude that he is mistaken. So teaches Francis Wayland. (*Principles and Practices of the Baptists*, pp. 106-108.) It is not safe to assume that every one is called to the ministry who thinks he is called. Therefore preparation for the ministry should be under the supervision of the church and of the ministry in a regular and orderly fashion.

3. It is not in question that many men may lawfully enter the ministry without pursuing the "full course." In all our seminaries provision is made for those who must take an "English course" or a "shorter course." As a trustee of Crozer Seminary, I beg to say emphatically that students of this class are welcomed, respected, helped in every way. Special instruction is given to them. If a man must

content himself with only one or two years of theological study, or if he is not in condition profitably to study the Bible in the originals, every kindly facility is provided that he may gain the best preparation possible in the circumstances. No man is more enthusiastic and painstaking in this good work than our "young professor," Johnson. (Long may he remain "young"!) I have no doubt the same thing is essentially true of all our seminaries.

Nay, more. Suppose a business man, with fair English education and in middle life, feels called to the ministry and gives evidence of fitness for it; and suppose that he should, under the guidance of some able minister, study the gospel and the doctrines of the New Testament, and the Bible as a whole, say for a year; and suppose that he should be able to pass a fair examination as a candidate for ordination, would it be easy to find a Baptist council that would refuse to ordain him because he had never been in college or seminary?

WHAT IS IN QUESTION:

What is in question is this: Is it good that schools should be established to enable and encourage men to enter the ministry with what may properly be called almost the least possible preparation? Let it be remembered that it is the avowed purpose of these schools to take "working men," persons who have generally only a common school education, and often less than that, and by a course of "simple and practical instruction" fit them for "preaching" and for "missionary work."

And further, Are these schools, on the plan proposed by the founders, likely to be safe? In considering these queries, I shall refer chiefly to foreign mission work; but the same principles are essentially applicable to work at home.

I. In regard to the first point, everything depends upon what is our theory of missions. There are three theories current:

THEORIES OF MISSIONS.

1. The theory of conquest, *i. e.*, that God intends by the preaching of the gospel to convert the entire race and introduce a period of universal holiness and happiness in this dispensation. The writer does not accept this theory. It seems to his mind impossible to hold it, in view of the constant teaching of the New Testament. For example, our Lord tells us positively that the "tares and the wheat" will grow together "until the harvest." Many honored brethren

ren, however, do hold this theory. But as the careful and wise policy which fits this theory fits also with equal exactness the third theory, it is not necessary, for present purposes, to discuss the comparative merits of the two views. But there is a theory now promulgated which demands a very different policy.

A CROSS-CUT METHOD OF EVANGELIZATION.

2. The theory of a single proclamation. It is now confidently declared that if the gospel can only be announced once to "every creature," the condition precedent to the Lord's return will have been fulfilled. Mr. Taylor, of the China Inland Mission, has made an elaborate calculation as to how many missionaries would be required, in order to go throughout all China and announce the gospel once to every inhabitant within the space (if I remember right) of three years. Such a work, we may infer, he considers a fair fulfilment of the condition "preached for a witness." I think that this plan may properly be called a cross-cut method of evangelization. No painful toil in founding and maintaining stations; no prayerful painstaking in "reasoning" with men "and persuading" them, after the example of Paul; no earnest devotion to the Christian culture of converts, if there should be any; no labor in Christian schools. A cross-cut, indeed, through the fields of evangelical work! Not so did Christ or his apostles understand labor in the gospel. I make bold to say that this is a preposterous method of evangelization. Not one in a hundred would understand, for this requires "line upon line, precept upon precept;" not one in a thousand would be impressed; not one in a hundred thousand would be converted. This plan is inspired by a certain extreme, restless and feverish form of "pre-millenarianism," which is so unhealthy that sensible people instinctively recoil from it, and which is peculiarly offensive, in my view, not only as tending to fanaticism and heresy, but as sure to bring what I sincerely believe to be the "way of truth" into evil report, even among sincere Christians.

3. The theory of evangelization by establishing witnessing churches. This was the working plan of the apostles. They struck for the cities as centres of influence. Entering a city, they preached and taught persistently. They organized the new converts into a church, diligently teaching them all things that Jesus had commanded. Generally they remained on the ground till

persecution broke out. Then they passed on to the next city, and by God's grace repeated the process. In due time they revisited the new-born churches, ordained elders, if this had not been done before, and confirmed the souls of the disciples in the faith. Later, they visited them again, or sent a competent substitute, or addressed to them letters of instruction and council. This is the policy which seems to me unquestionably the right one. The witnessing churches will grow, extend their influence, and fill the "region round about" with the sound of the gospel. The majority, always and everywhere, will refuse the gracious call; but the elect will hear. This is the only practicable theory of missions, with such modifications as circumstances may demand. No nation can be evangelized by men of another land. They must be leaders, teachers, generals. The main force must be native laborers, raised up in the witnessing churches. This work, in my opinion, ought to be carried on, as widely as possible, until the Lord shall come.

THE KIND OF MEN NEEDED.

If we were to adopt the second theory of missions, there would be reason in filling the land with "short-cut" schools, so that thousands might go forth to perambulate the world and preach the gospel, *i.e.*, announce salvation by Christ, once, to "every creature." A very meagre preparation would suffice for that. But if our missionaries are to plant and to plan, to establish witnessing churches, to instruct native preachers and assistants, to furnish a Christian literature, to meet the subtle errors of hoary superstition, and guard the new-born churches from error, corruption, and fanaticism—if this is their task—ought they not to have at least a fair literary and theological education, and whenever possible, the full, thorough training?

The easy-made or ready-made evangelists of our day would cut a sorry figure in reasoning with the acute Brahmin or Confucian, coping with the wily Jesuit, planting churches, planning for the future, guarding the converts against errors which they themselves do not understand, guiding those who might know almost as much as their teachers. Better set a youth who can draw a house distinguishable from a horse to plan a cathedral! Similar considerations apply, with almost equal force, to work in the ministry among the active, restless, and sceptical minds that throng our Western towns and cities.

Ther
does no
of miss
be good
schools
abled a
with th
ing.

II.
be safe
than t
or pos
the p
the su
things
what
bilitie
now h

1.
sible
cal ed
super
how
action
men
good
ciate
they
their

Ag
to p
Oug
what
lieve
Can
in c
man
take
a st
men
com
Are
and
pen
one
clai

2
one
cer
wo
ad
mi
lin
Ne
of
ple
th
as
ar

Therefore, as "cross-cut evangelization" does not appear to be the right conception of missionary work, so it does not seem to be good that we should have "short-cut" schools, by means of which men shall be enabled and encouraged to enter the ministry, with the minimum of knowledge and training.

A FEW QUERIES.

II. Are the "short-cut" schools likely to be safe? That is, are there dangers, other than that just named, which may probably or possibly arise from their work or from the precedent set by it? On this part of the subject I am not fully informed. Some things we know; other things we infer from what we read; others occur to us as possibilities. A few queries only will, therefore, now be suggested.

1. Why undenominational? What possible advantage in this feature? Theological education ought to be under the careful supervision of the church and the ministry; how can this be secured except through the action of each denomination by itself? If men of various denominations, however good or able, but self-chosen and self-associated, undertake this work, to whom are they responsible or under what control can their work be?

Again, these schools profess to teach men to preach the gospel, if nothing else. Ought not the teachers to be agreed as to what the gospel is? Do not Baptists believe that baptism is a part of the gospel? Can the pupils in these schools be trained in our doctrine and practice? A young man of culture, well indoctrinated, might take a course at Princeton and come forth a straight Baptist. But how will these men, not of culture or well indoctrinated, come forth from the "short-cut" schools? Are we to have an inundation of evangelists and missionaries who will not preach "repent and be baptized," but mutilate the one thing which they are supposed to proclaim?

2. Why are women in these schools? No one denies that women may be useful in certain lines of religious and missionary work. But preaching the gospel, public address, and presiding over churches and mission stations do not fall within those lines, according to the plain teaching of the New Testament, and the faith and practice of our denomination. Will these principles be clearly inculcated? Is it understood that the women will not be encouraged to aspire to work which belongs to men? Or, are these schools to send out female evan-

gelists? If so, we may have more women in the "new Northwest" receiving "ordination," as has already happened, at least once, in Nebraska. And we may have female preachers in the foreign field. Mr. Taylor speaks, I think, of what could be done by some thousands of men and women traversing China with the gospel message. It would be an edifying spectacle, indeed, to see a company of American Baptist men and women, mostly unmarried, going out together to travel as evangelists, dressed in native garb, and flitting from town to town, somewhat after the manner of the Salvation Army. Will these schools encourage and train women to preach?

3. Will fanaticism be encouraged or discouraged? It is well known that there are already wandering "evangelists," both male and female, who have abandoned the safe and true doctrine that the Holy Spirit makes to us no new or direct revelations, but guides our minds by the light of revelation and reason. They profess to be specially and immediately "directed" by him; and this leads not only to much folly, but often to the making void of the commandments of God. How will these schools teach on this point?

Many preach a gospel almost devoid of repentance, regeneration, and obedience to the commands of Jesus; "only believe," they say, in a sense far from scriptural; with them, if one wishes to be a Christian, and will "stand up," or "kneel down," or "give his name," he is a Christian. Will these schools carefully guard their pupils against such soul-destroying errors in doctrine and practice?

Some are maintaining the "no purse and scrip" theory; others expect to get food and clothing "in answer to prayer," and are virtually beggars. Will such be taught to act in a sane and manly manner?

Some have wild notions as to "faith" and the "prayer of faith." They no longer define "faith" as confidence in God and in his promises, so far as we have promises, coupled with submission to his will. When in their own imagination they have "faith to believe" that this or that will come to pass, *i.e.*, work themselves up to such a belief or "impression," they consider this a token and pledge that God will surely grant their request. At these schools will such hurtful errors be corrected and the sensible and scriptural view be taught?

Many accept and teach the doctrine of "faith healing," that caricature and perversion of the biblical conception of miracles. Will these schools, or either of them, give

the least encouragement to such ideas? Unquestionably many ignorant and unstable persons, with very crude notions, will resort to the "short-cut" schools. Will every effort be made to correct their crude notions by Scripture and reason? For example, if one of the students, suffering from astigmatism or some other defect of vision, were to announce that he "had been to Jesus about his eyesight" and had abandoned oculist and glasses, as needing them no more, and should exhort others to act on the same principle, would so foolish a delusion be kindly checked and repressed? Or if one, like some of Bishop Taylor's missionaries in Africa, were to refuse quinine when suffering from malaria and expect healing in answer to prayer without the use of means, also exhorting others to do likewise, would the sin and folly of such conduct be emphatically pointed out and these fanatical views be firmly checked and repressed?

If these questions could receive a perfectly frank, plain, and straightforward answer, we could judge better than we can now, whether any perils attend the new departure in ministerial education, beyond the obvious one involved in encouraging men to enter the ministry with an exceedingly meagre preparation.

A cold-hearted, unspiritual ministry, minimizing the divine call and the need of the Holy Spirit's aid, would be a terrible curse; only less terrible than an ill-trained, mis-trained ministry; men mistaking their own vain impressions for the monitions of the Holy Spirit; rash, headstrong, and arrogant in exact proportion to their ignorance and self-conceit; ready for any vagary or heresy. A swarm of such evangelists and missionaries would do incalculable harm at home and abroad. It behooves our denomination to inquire seriously whether there is any danger of our being visited with a plague—worse than the plague of locusts.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

BY R. R. MCBURNEY.

From *The Christian Advocate*, New York, March 30, 1890.

ORGANIZATIONS for religious work by young men for young men have been in operation from an early period. Wilson, in his *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches*, mentions the existence of such

societies in London in 1632, and states that the members met for prayer, reading, and religious conversation with the view of strengthening each other against the solicitations of evil company. The Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, in his *Life of Bishop Beveridge*, states that the societies greatly contributed to the revival of religious feeling in London, and extended into different parts of the country. Bishop Burnett, in the *History of His Own Times*, speaks highly of the good done by them.

The Rev. Josiah Woodward, D.D., in his history of the rise and progress of these societies, says:

As their sense of the blessedness of religion and the value of immortal souls increased, they could not but exercise bowels of compassion toward such as discovered little concern about these important matters. . . . This inclined them to endeavor, by discourse with their acquaintances in proper seasons, to press upon them those divine arguments whereby themselves had been roused out of a state of carnal insensibleness; and, finding that the grace of God many times seconded these their Christian admonitions to good effect, they became more habituated to good discourse, especially where there was any probability of civil acceptance of it, inasmuch that at length they could not but stand amazed at the success which it pleased God to give them.

These religious societies of young men beginning during the reign of Charles I. maintained a continuous existence for nearly one hundred years throughout the Revolution and the reigns of Charles II. and of James II., and attained their highest prosperity during the reign of William and Mary.

About 1729, when John Wesley was a fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, a serious man, whom he had travelled many miles to see, said to him: "Sir, you wish to serve God and go to heaven. Remember that you cannot serve Him alone; you must therefore find companions or make them. The Bible knows nothing of solitary religion." The Rev. Henry Moore, his biographer, says that he never forgot this, and that on his return to the university he first spoke to his brother Charles, and afterward to Mr. Morgan, Mr. Hervey, Mr. Whitefield, and others, and this led to the formation of an association by these young men in the university. It was tauntingly named by their fellow-students "The Godly Club."

"Several members of this association afterward went as missionaries to Georgia. During their visits to London, going and returning, these students became intimately associated with the young men's societies mentioned by Woodward, and with others, especially those meeting in Westminster, Fetter Lane, and Aldersgate Street."

It was in the meeting in Aldersgate Street, May 24, 1738, that John Wesley experienced a change wrought in his own soul, of which he says:

"In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street" (the society to which Mr. Wesley refers met in Nettleton Court, Aldersgate Street, close by what is now called Nicholl Square, Cripplegate, E. C.), "where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was

describing
through
warned.
—for sal
that he l
saved me
to pray v
more esp
persecute
what I n

The
Young
begun i
a young
Paul's
the irr
by one
for pra
Soon t
1844,
public
Coffee
Hill, u

The
thousa
world,
sionary
way, a
tinent
ain ar
Germa
mark,
and S
in Be
9; in
15; i
Turke
in So
Hawa
ropea
Arger
Chili.

In
have
colleg
bran
at 90
recog
ment
finan
Fo
been
Fren
men
doin
all,
Him
but
A
hire
floor
read

describing the change God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ—Christ alone—for salvation; and an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death. I began to pray with all my might for those who had in a more especial manner despitely used me and persecuted me. I then testified openly to all there what I now first felt in my heart."

The present movement, known as the Young Men's Christian Association, was begun in London by George Williams, then a young clerk in a dry-goods house, in St. Paul's Church-yard. He was so moved by the irreligion of his fellow clerks that one by one he invited them into his bed-room for prayer and the study of the Scriptures. Soon the room became too small. In June, 1844, an organization was effected, and public meetings were held in St. Margaret's Coffee House, St. Martin's Court, Ludgate Hill, until permanent quarters were secured.

The little one has become nearly four thousand. Throughout the Christian world, and in heathen lands where the Missionary work of the Church has opened the way, associations are found. On this continent there are over 1,300; in Great Britain and Ireland, 611; in France, 61; in Germany, 680; in Holland, 448; in Denmark, 86; in Switzerland, 384; in Norway and Sweden, 63; in Italy, 34; in Spain, 9; in Belgium, 27; in Austria and Hungary, 9; in Russia, 9; in India, 6; in Ceylon, 15; in China, 5; in Japan, 6; in Asiatic Turkey, 11; in Syria, 6; in Madagascar, 2; in South Africa, 10; in Australasia, 18; in Hawaii, 4; in the West Indies, 5; in European Turkey, Persia, Mexico, Bermuda, Argentine Republic, British Guiana, and Chili, 1 each.

In order to reach college men associations have been formed in over 300 American colleges, and to reach railroad employes branches of the association are in operation at 90 railroad centres. Railroad officials so recognize their usefulness in the improvement of their men that hearty moral and financial support is rendered.

For other special classes branches have been called in to being, namely, for Germans, French, commercial travellers, colored young men, miners, woodsmen, and Indians, each doing a special work for its own class, and all, we believe, inspired by the Spirit of Him who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister.

At the outset it was deemed sufficient to hire one or two rooms in the third or fourth floor of a building in an obscure street for a reading-room and for prayer-meetings. The

leaders in America soon discovered that, if those who most needed the association were to be reached, the association must come down stairs, where the young men were to be found, and adapt their agencies, so far as possible, to the varied needs of the class sought. The men of the New York Association were the first to aggressively assert that, if the associations were to be successful in their mission, they must include the whole man in their plan of work. In order to this the erection of buildings specially adapted to the enlarged scheme became necessary. Much preliminary effort was demanded. This was heartily and zealously undertaken by such Christian men as Mr. William E. Dodge, Jr., Mr. Morris K. Jesup, Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, Mr. Cephas Brainerd, Mr. Abner W. Colgate, Mr. John S. Kennedy, Mr. John Crosby Brown, Mr. Bowles Colgate, Mr. James Stokes and their associates. The clergy and the press became interested. Money was secured, lots purchased, and the building on the corner of Twenty-third Street and Fourth Avenue was erected, at a cost of nearly \$500,000, and the enlarged work was commenced December, 1869. Evening educational classes, a library, reading, and social rooms, and gymnasium were opened, and within two months six thousand young men entered upon the enjoyment of the advantages. The building was opened only for one hour on Sundays, while a Bible class was in session. The late Bishop Edmund S. Janes urged the opening of the social rooms and library on Sundays. This was done later. Now these rooms are open except during the hours of morning service in the churches. Following the example of New York, in all the leading cities and in many small towns buildings have been erected aggregating in value nearly \$8,000,000. In New York State alone there are thirty-five buildings, eight of which are the free gift of individuals, namely, at Albany, Addison, Brooklyn, Clifton Springs, Cornell University, Hamilton College, Railroad Men's Building in New York, and at Watertown.

Young men in our cities and towns have now placed within their reach places of moral, spiritual, and intellectual, healthful, social resort in which to spend their leisure hours. In this city branches are in operation in well adapted buildings for all classes of young men, namely, at Twenty-third Street and Fourth Avenue, at 222 and 224 Bowery, 153 and 155 East Eighty-sixth Street, and at 3, 5, and 7 West One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street; for young

men out of employment and in destitute circumstances at 153 Bowery, corner of Broome Street, where lodging and food are furnished free, and religious services for men only are held every evening of the week and on Sunday afternoons; for German-speaking young men at 140 and 142 Second Avenue, near Ninth Street. The branch for French-speaking young men occupies rented rooms at 128 West Twenty-third Street, and work for railroad men is carried on in the Railroad Men's Building, the gift of Mr. C. Vanderbilt, on Madison Avenue, corner Forty-fifth Street, and at the old Hudson River Railroad Station, West Thirtieth Street, near Tenth Avenue, at the Round House, Seventy-second Street and Eleventh Avenue, and at the Weehawken Station, and at New Durham, N. J. At all of these points the work is under the control and direction of the Board of Directors of the Young Men's Christian Association of this city. The expenses of the work in New York City in 1889, except that of the Railroad Department, which is wholly met by the railroad officials and the dues of the members, amounted to \$107,679. Of this sum \$32,489 was received from members' dues, \$38,616 in gifts from friends, and the balance, \$36,574, from rentals and other sources.

In 1866 the International Committee charged with the supervision of the association work in the United States and the Dominion of Canada was located in New York City. For some years the members of the committee carried on the work committed to them through correspondence and some slight visitation. The plan worked ineffectively, as the business men composing the committee could not spare the time necessary for extended visitation. It became apparent that competent men must be secured to give their entire time to the work of visitation. Now fifteen secretaries and four assistants are employed by the committee. In 1866 but \$800 was expended in publication and travelling expenses. Last year \$50,444 was expended, one-quarter of which was the gift of friends in this city.

In 1866 less than twelve men were giving their entire time as secretaries of the local associations; now nine hundred are so employed. The expenses of the local associations last year amounted to nearly \$1,500,000, and that of State committees to about \$90,000.

These gifts in money come from thoughtful, observing men, and to a considerable extent from members of churches of the various Denominations under whose eyes it

is carried on, and give ample proof that the work of the association is thoroughly appreciated. In all these respects there has been remarkable growth, for which the friends of young men have abundant cause for gratitude to God.

In the beginning the movement was looked upon with distrust by many pastors and many Christian people. This was due to the unwise zeal of some of the associations and to a want of intelligent knowledge by them and by pastors and the Christian public of the true object and methods of the work. It is now rare indeed to find in any community a pastor or parent who does not approve of the methods and work of these societies.

Among the reasons of the growth in prosperity and favor with which the associations have been blessed may be named:

First, they meet a real and felt need. Young men will have places of resort in which to spend leisure hours. Some may say those who have homes should spend their leisure hours there; but young men are gregarious, and will have associations of some kind, and unless safe places are provided they will frequent such as lead downward. In all our towns and cities there are large numbers of young men without homes living in cheerless boarding-houses with few agreeable surroundings. Very few young men full of life and energy will spend their evenings in small, cold, and cheerless bedrooms, when warm and well-lighted saloons invite them at every corner. The association meets the needs of young men in these respects as no other agency does.

Some say the local church should provide gymnasias, educational classes, libraries, reading-rooms, recreation, amusement, and social resorts for its young men. As a matter of fact, which should not be overlooked, very few churches in any community have the means to do so. The united churches of a community, where a well equipped association is carried on, do furnish these advantages under Christian influences, and the controlling body in every association is composed of communicants of churches.

Second, the recognition by the associations of the subordinate relation they sustain to the Church of Christ; that the association is of human and the Church of divine institution; that the chief affection and service of the members is due to the churches to which they respectively belong.

Experience has shown that the most active workers in the associations are among the most loyal and active workers in their own churches, and that the churches having

the last
associations
good
Every
ations
their
their

Thi
of the
the n
Spirit
the h
all ag
ciation
For
young

In
and
unsel
men
order
may
led i

Th
ion
bless
with
large
mun

W
mos
a da
we

H
Her
unse
vate
litz
Uni
dies
Hin
L

(S
belo
fath
The
pea
per
nou
in t

A
S
of
by
low

the largest number of active members in the associations receive in return the greatest good from the work of the associations. Every available means is used by the associations to bring young men who come under their influence into relation to a church of their choice.

Third, the prominence given to the study of the Holy Scriptures, to the necessity of the new birth, and to the work of the Holy Spirit in the renewal and sanctification of the heart and life, and the subordination of all agencies to the spiritual aim of the associations.

Fourth, the confining of the work to young men by young men.

In a word, the associations seek to awake and develop in their active membership an unselfish Christ-like concern for all young men with whom they come in contact, in order that such of them as follow not Christ may by God's blessing upon their efforts be led into the Christian life.

These are among the reasons in the opinion of the writer why God has so signally blessed these societies, and given them favor with the pastors, fathers, and mothers, and large-minded men and women in every community.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

From *The British Weekly*, London, March 14, 1890.

WHEN about to write an account of the most important contribution made for many a day to the defence of the Old Testament, we received the following :

Heute früh nach sechs Uhr entschlief sanft im Herrn nach längerem Leiden im 78. Lebensjahr unser innigstgeliebter Gatte, Vater, Schwiegervater und Grossvater, D. Theol. et Phil. Franz Delitzsch, ordentlicher Professor der Theologie an der Universität Leipzig, u.s.w. Schmerzerfüllt zeigt dies hierdurch an, zugleich im Namen der übrigen Hinterbliebenen.

Leipzig, den 4. März, 1890.

CLARA DELITZSCH geb. SILBER.

(Soon after six o'clock this morning our dearly beloved husband, father, father-in-law and grandfather, Franz Delitzsch, D.D., Ph.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Leipzig, etc., fell peacefully asleep in the Lord, after a lengthened period of suffering, in his 78th year. This announcement is published by his mourning widow in the name of the other surviving relations.

CLARA DELITZSCH née SILBER.

Leipzig, March 4, 1890.)

So has gone out one of the greatest lights of Christendom. His holy spirit now shines by the Seven Lamps of Fire on which he loved to dilate. After a life of measureless

love and labor, he is now with Him who for nearly sixty years has known his works, and charity, and service, and faith, and his patience, and his works ; and the last to be more than the first.

The profound and far-reaching authority of Dr. Delitzsch had its spring in his personal character. Who could look on that dear, solemn, serious face, with its wistful, benignant eyes, and its lines of care, without recognizing the soul that gave it such brightness ? It lay next in his faith and piety. A mystic born out of due time, or rather taken away in the dawning revival of apostolic theology, he struck the deep resounding notes which there are always ears to hear in the meanest, shallowest days. His stores of knowledge were so vast that in some respects he was without a rival in Europe, and his insight into Scripture was so delicate and profound that among its interpreters he had but few peers. His industry was more than German. To a guest in his house it seemed as if he was always awake. Labor was piled on labor, and yet (except when he were sorely worried by examinations) all seemed to be done lightly ; he more than conquered the claims made upon him ; he had time to rest, and talk pleasantly on all that passed, beaming through his spectacles ; and there seemed to be nothing of which he was ignorant. Dr. Delitzsch loved to know what his pupils were doing : he kept friendly watch over them, and would inquire for those scattered through England, Scotland, and America, with an interest as keen as he showed in those of his own country.

We earnestly hope that Dr. Delitzsch's letters and manuscripts will be put in skilful hands, and that a full biography will appear without exorbitant delay. These materials are almost unexampled in richness and value. As is well known, he was a native of Leipzig, where he died. But many are not aware that his tenure of a professorship there is of comparatively recent date—only since 1867. He was first at Rostock, that quaint Mecklenburg town, with its " Baltic Gothic " churches visible far out at sea. Rostock was then, and remains, the headquarters of strict orthodoxy in Germany. Delitzsch was not very comfortable there, but we need not revive the memory of the theological controversies in which the Rostock theologians were involved with him and others of his friends. About ten years ago we visited at Rostock the veteran Philippi, whose commentary on Romans is not unknown in this country. Philippi retained his early distrust of Delitzsch as " in all

things too susceptible;" "the man who made a hole in the wall." After four years he removed to Erlangen, where he found himself with more congenial spirits—above all, with the great and sainted Hofmann, the Delitzsch of the New Testament. Here he taught with eminent success and growing fame for sixteen years, when he removed to Leipzig. His work there is known in all the Christian world, and he sustained his fame to the last—never having the humiliation which even came to Ewald of having to face empty benches. He kept busy with his pen, issuing articles, new books, and fresh editions constantly. The final and definitive edition of his noblest work—that on the Psalms—with the last corrections of his own hands, is issued in the "Foreign Biblical Library" of Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, and "Isaiah" will shortly follow. "Iris," a charming little volume of essays, has just been issued by Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh.

The great peculiarity of Delitzsch was that he combined the scholar and the mystic—or rather, perhaps, the theosophist. As a Hebraist he was confessedly among the first: in his knowledge of post-Biblical Hebrew he was unrivalled. It is touching to know that his deep concern for the salvation of Israel, "without which the circle of God's commiserations remains unclosed," was the first inducement that led him to the study of Hebrew. How this passion glowed and burned in him to the very last of life—what toils, sacrifices, and heartbreaking disappointments he went through that Israel might be saved, only the Shepherd of Israel knows. In his magazine *Saat auf Hoffnung* he unceasingly pleaded the cause, and his heart was refreshed by the remarkable movement of Rabinowitz. But his chief contribution, and the work he valued above all the rest, was his Hebrew translation of the New Testament, on which he bestowed incredible toil. He was, perhaps, not so great in criticism as in exegesis. Wellhausen once said to the present writer, "Delitzsch knows much, but he has no method;" and other critics less prejudiced have judged similarly. But it was no small thing that his saintly character and overwhelming authority were given to the encouragement of earnest and reverent criticism of the Old Testament. "Fear nothing," said he on one occasion to the writer, "from any criticism that is believing, but let all critics fear to offend the little ones of Christ." He even went further than many think necessary in concession to modern criticism; and treated with proud

gentleness those who accused him of unfaithfulness to the Gospel.

For he was faithful—a father of the faithful. The first book which deeply moved him, by an East Frisian schoolmaster, Niddersten, "Feelings and Experiences in Christianity," was always his dearest companion. "There," said he, "you will find the real kernel of my theology." Two men of our day above all their European contemporaries have been recognized as able to set forth the deep things of God—Martensen and Delitzsch. Both were pupils of Jacob Böhme, the greatest of all theosophists. "I have," said Delitzsch, "busied myself with his writings much and long, and have derived from him largely my view of God and the world." (We are quoting from memory.) Then, as he explained in his memorable *Expositor* article, the miracles of Divine grace which he witnessed under the preaching of the Gospel in his early days, set his feet on a rock. "There is," said he in a letter we published on November 18, 1887, "a realm of nature and a realm of grace. He who denies the realm of grace must also deny the efficacy of prayer, the work of the Holy Spirit in the soul, and consequently the freedom of man. As for me, I am a supernaturalist. As I say in the preface to my new Commentary on Genesis, I do not profess the 'religion of the age of Darwin.'" These golden words he has enlarged and fortified in many pages which we could wish to see competently edited and translated. His "System of Biblical Psychology" is so badly rendered that many paragraphs look like, and really are, sheer gibberish. His "System of Christian Apologetics," published about the time he came to Leipzig, deserves to be far better known. His life and faith, however, were their own justification. He had a direct and seldom obscured vision of the spiritual universe. The epitaph of another might well be inscribed on his grave: "Here lies one who loved and believed, and prayed."

THE FEDERATION OF CHURCHES.

BY THE REV. JULIUS H. WARD.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, March 22, 1890.

IN the movement toward Christian unity one's sense of advance depends very much upon his point of view. If he sees the movements of the day in the light of his own religious body there is almost no ad-

vance at all. The way is not clear, and the barriers are seemingly insurmountable. If a different position is taken, if one looks at the centripetal forces in religious society, it is possible to see things very differently. All the organized Christianity in this country emphasizes our divisions, but the higher thought of the hour and the better judgments of good men bring us into close agreement. It is in the flowing together of Christian sympathies, in the drawing together of people who are so earnest in reaching out to great ends, that they forget the doctrinal differences which divide them, that one can trace to-day perhaps a more determined effort to reach a working and practical unity among Christians than has been noted before in the United States. The declaration of the bishops in 1886 has had a perceptible influence, and for the different Christian bodies the Evangelical Alliance has begun a work that promises good results in every community. We need to strive for unity in two directions. People need to be instructed in the reasons why our own Communion adheres to the Episcopate and insists that it shall be recognized as one of the conditions of unity. Outside of the Episcopal Church not one person in a hundred has the slightest conception of what an authoritative ministry means. The personal duty in Christian living has been insisted upon, but the conception of the Church as a religious home and of what the Church does for one has never been presented or considered, much less the nature of the Church and its historical continuity. It is for this reason that an immense amount of the simplest instruction is needed before any sort of adequate conception of what the Church is in its integrity can be widely diffused among Christian people outside of our own membership. In this light we are a long way from unity.

Dr. McCosh has recently proposed, and the Evangelical Alliance has already entered upon the undertaking wherever it is practicable, that the neglected and non-church-going class in Protestant communities shall be reached by a method of co-operative visiting from house to house, by which it shall be ascertained how far the present religious organizations reach the whole of the community, and the non-church-going class may be put in touch with the religious bodies for which they have a personal preference. There can be no question that the non-church-goers form a large and increasing portion of the community, and that no efforts for the uplifting of the people as a

whole will be satisfactory where such co-operative efforts are not thoroughly made and followed up with adequate personal visitation and kindly sympathy. This is the beginning of efforts toward treating the field by co-operation as a competent pastor would treat a community where he had the sole spiritual charge. The difficulty is that a working agreement must be entered into before any such plan can be successful. It is not impossible to work by such a method in the Protestant denominations, and one can see that great benefits may accrue from such a combination of effort, but it must proceed upon unsectarian and non-proselytizing lines. It is a strong test of human nature to enter upon an effort like this and carry it through with a large charity and with the thoroughness which enlists one's full convictions, but in the realization of such simple methods of reaching a working unity lies the success of the larger plan which implies the reconciliation of different denominations to one another on a higher basis than that which we at present occupy. The Evangelical Alliance has found a practical field of operation in the cities and in some of the large towns by inducing the different pastors to work in concert for the hunting up of neglected people, and as far as this work can be entered upon it is of great value. Dr. McCosh does not go much farther than the practical development of this plan in town and country. It is easy to see the difficulties which beset it, but these are no greater or more serious than those which constantly beset the worthiest enterprises. It is the beginning of Christian effort in which the lines of work are not inconsistent with devotion to one's own denomination. The Episcopal Church would have more at stake in such united efforts than the other denominations which differ mostly in the emphasis which they give to different doctrines, but there is no essential reason why we should not co-operate with our religious neighbors in an effort which is sure to bring excellent results in every community or neighborhood where it is consistently introduced and followed up. Here is really the first step, and in these initiatory efforts the Evangelical Alliance, under its present management, is entitled to great praise for making the right sort of beginning.

The plan here proposed and already introduced in many places is really the beginning of practical unity, but the effort to bring people out to religious worship is only a small part of what needs to be done in order to lift up the tone of both city and com-

munity and make our present life strong and wholesome. In all denominations the religious life has been too much regarded on its doctrinal side and too little attention has been given to the building up of the social life in which our religion is put on trial. The enlargement of the sphere of Christian action, so that the parish shall represent all that is wholesome in life, is one of the most pressing demands to-day in our social development, and it is by these marks, at least in part, that the friends of Christ among us are now best known. In these efforts to make society Christian a higher work is undertaken than that of hunting up people who do not go to Church. It is the second step in reaching the community through the individual. The federation of churches, if it is ever accomplished, must be reached by indirect methods, through which the ministers and the active people in different denominations in the same community learn to work in common, and to set greater store upon making the social life of their neighborhood wholesome than upon enlarging the membership of their churches. It is not beyond the range of the Evangelical Alliance to promote such efforts, and they are the outcome of what Dr. McCosh proposes in the way of Christian federation. But this secondary step is valuable in another respect. The religious leaders in every community know far too little of the good things in other bodies than their own, and the working together for something beyond their own limits and in which they share the life of others would soon bring them to appreciate that with which they are not familiar; and when prejudices have been worn off, the more constructive efforts which have to do with organic unity could be put forth. This is where the lines of effort to-day are practicable. We have something more to do than to set down the fixed terms on which, as a religious body, we will unite with other Christians. That is too much like squaring off in an attitude of self-righteousness from which no good is likely to come. The Episcopal Church has nothing to lose and very much to gain from coming into closer contact with the different Protestant organizations, and where united work and comprehensive effort does not involve the denial of principles, the sharing in the sympathies and labors of others for great common ends is sure to bring the blessing of Christ and of the Holy Spirit upon what is done. In this light the federation of Churches is not a dream of the imagination, and it involves the possible making known of the good things which the Church would

gladly communicate to those who have never found out the better method which has been transmitted from the beginning.

THE MARIES OF THE GOSPELS.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, April 5, 1890.

It may not be uninteresting or unprofitable to the general reader if we make a few historical comments upon the subject which stands at the head of this article. Questions of some intricacy are involved in the discrimination between the holy women bearing the name of Mary, and controversies of real moment turn upon the relationships existing, or supposed to exist, between two at least of those who will come before us in the following sketch.

There would seem to be, then, no better way of proceeding than, in the first place, to put together all that can be collected in the Holy Gospels relating to each one of the name; and then to consider the more difficult matters of relationships and identity.

To begin, then, we seem clearly justified by the sacred narrative in recognizing four different persons each bearing the same, not then uncommon, name of Mary—namely, (1) the blessed Virgin Mary, (2) Mary of Magdala, (3) Mary of Bethany, and (4) Mary, the wife of Clopas. In the Acts of the Apostles (Acts xii. 12), we meet with yet another Mary, the mother of John Mark; but in the present paper we have only to consider the first four.

What does the gospel history tell us of each?

1. In regard of the Blessed Virgin, we have somewhat full notices of her early life, only two or three notices of her after life, and one faint but most touching indication of with whom, and perhaps also where, in all probability, her holy life was ultimately spent. Legend and apocryphal story has, as we might have expected, sought to supply fuller details, but to these we can only make passing allusions.

The Blessed Virgin comes before us in the narrative of St. Luke as dwelling, at least at the time of the annunciation, at Nazareth in Galilee, being then betrothed to Joseph, an undoubted descendant of David, and so spoken of by the angel in the dream recorded by St. Matthew (Matt. i. 20). If verification of this last point were needed, it is abundantly supplied by the statement of Hegesippus (Euseb. "Hist.," iii. 20), that members of the family appeared afterward before Domitian as de-

[May,
never
s been

ELS.

D. D.
5, 1890.
fitable
w his-
which
Ques-
n the
omen
ersies
ships
n two
us in

better
place,
ed in
f the
diffi-
ity.
tified
four
, not
nely.
ry of
(4)
ts of
with
John
have

us of

, we
life,
life,
tion
e, in
ately
has,
sup-
only

s in
, at
, at
hed
Da-
the
. i.
ere
the
c.,"
ap-
de-

1890.]

THE MARIES OF THE GOSPELS.

103

scendants of the house of David. But here a question of some interest is raised: Was the Virgin Mary also a descendant of David? It has been maintained by good interpreters that the words "of the house of David" (Luke i. 27) are to be referred, not simply to the immediately preceding substantive "Joseph," but also to the antecedent portion of the clause, so that we are to understand that both parents were of the Davidic family. It is added, that the fact of the Virgin Mary having travelled with Joseph to Bethlehem, at the time of the enrolment, points in the same direction, and that St. Luke's genealogy (Luke iii. 23 *seq.*) is to be regarded as giving her actual pedigree.

On the other hand, it is contended, and apparently with preponderant probability, that, in the first passage, the connection is much more natural, if it be considered that the words "of the house of David" refer solely to Joseph; that, in reference to the journey to Bethlehem, the evangelist could hardly have failed to have placed the clause giving the reason of the journey not, as it stands, in the singular number, and immediately after the mention of Joseph, but after both clauses, and in the plural number, "because they," etc. The studied perspicuity with which St. Luke always writes is here an argument of considerable force. Into the supposed argument from the genealogy of St. Luke, it will not be possible to enter in this paper. It may be enough to say that there is nothing in the text, whatever be the order of the words that may be adopted as the true reading, that would lead to the supposition that St. Luke was here giving the genealogy of the Virgin Mary. The only fact from which any inference could be drawn as to the tribe of the Virgin, is the fact of her being related to the mother of the Baptist (Luke i. 36), who, we know, was of the daughters of Aaron (Luke i. 5); but even here the mention of the relationship is in too general terms to justify the deduction that, as is maintained by Ewald and others, Mary was of the tribe of Levi. At any rate, if it was so, it could never have occupied any prominence in Christian thought; for compare Hebrews vii. 14.

Some faint difficulty remains as to the original home of the Virgin Mary. It is contended that, from the language of St. Matthew (Matt. ii. 22, 23), we are to conclude that this could not have been Galilee, but was probably Bethlehem. Whether such an inference can fairly be drawn from the words may properly be doubted. At any rate, the language of St. Luke is so dis-

tinct and consistent as to Nazareth being the original home of Joseph and Mary (Luke ii. 39), that we must abide by it, and be satisfied that if we knew all the details we should be able to account for the apparent tenor of the words of St. Matthew. It is, at least, quite conceivable that Joseph and Mary may have intended, after the marvellous circumstances connected with our Lord's birth, to have made Bethlehem their future abode, and that they thus naturally contemplated, in the first instance, a return to the new home (Matt. ii. 22).

Into the further facts connected with the Blessed Virgin which are disclosed in the gospel narrative, we do not propose here to enter, our object being simply to discriminate between the four who bear the name, in regard of merely external circumstances. In conclusion, we may notice that according to tradition the parents of the Virgin were Joachim, a person of influence, and Anna or Anne, the daughter of a priest bearing the name of Matthan; that Mary was the child of their old age; that she was fifteen years old at the birth of our Lord, and that she died at the age of fifty-nine,—or, according to others, at the age of seventy-two,—and was buried at Ephesus. The connection of her name with Ephesus is natural enough, as early writers (Irenæus, Eusebius) specify that city as the final home of St. John, to whom, as we well remember, our dying Lord committed this highly favored and blessed woman.

2. The second Mary, as in order of the mention of her name in the gospel narrative, is Mary Magdalene, or Mary of Magdala,—a place on the western shore of the Lake of Galilee, and now bearing the name of *Mejdet*, perhaps identical with the Magadan mentioned in Matthew xv. 39 (Rev. Ver.). We first meet with this Mary in the notice given by St. Luke (Luke viii. 2 *seq.*) of the women who, after having been "healed of evil spirits and infirmities," accompanied the Lord and his apostles in their missionary journeyings, and "ministered unto them of their substance." It is specially noted by the evangelist (see also Mark xvi. 9) that "seven devils" had, by the Lord's merciful healing, gone forth from her. From the hint afforded by the demoniac or demoniacs of Gadara, we may suppose that a simultaneous possession is alluded to (comp. also Matt. xii. 25; Luke xi. 26); and from the word "healed" we may not unnaturally suppose that it was a bodily, rather than a spiritual case, and that the popular identification of Mary Magdalene with the unknown woman who anointed the Lord's feet in the

house of the Pharisee Simon (Luke vii. 36 *sqq.*), is mistaken, and morally improbable. Still more indefensible is the identification of this anointing mentioned by St. Luke, and that mentioned by St. Matthew (Matt. xxvi. 6), St. Mark (Mark xiv. 3), and St. John (John xii. 3), as having taken place at Bethany, and the consequent confusion between Mary of Magdala and Mary of Bethany.

The last incident connected with this devoted woman is the manifestation of the risen Lord vouchsafed to her early on the resurrection morn, in the garden of the sepulchre (John xx. 11 *sqq.*). Two things would seem always connected with the memory of Mary Magdalene, if we may draw any inference from the mention of her name by St. Mark (Mark xvi. 9),—that she was rescued from the indwelling of devils, and was the first to whom the Lord appeared after his resurrection from the dead.

Legend has sought to identify her with the daughter of the Canaanitish woman (Matt. xv. 22; Mark vii. 25), but, it need hardly be said, on no grounds that rise above scarcely plausible conjecture.

3. The third Mary of the Gospels is Mary of Bethany, first mentioned by St. Luke (Luke x. 39) as being the sister of a certain Martha, who, at some place not specified, received our Lord into her house at some time, as it would seem, in the course of our Lord's last journey. It is certain, from the subsequent narrative of the evangelist (see Luke xiii. 22; xvii. 11), that our Lord could not have yet arrived at Bethany. It has been supposed, therefore, by some expositors, that this must have been on some former visit to Jerusalem. This much, at any rate, would appear to be certain,—that the family were so well known to our Lord as to have been loved by him (John xi. 3, 5) some time previous to his visit, at the raising of Lazarus. The conjecture, therefore, may be considered plausible.

The circumstance with which the name of Mary of Bethany appears to have been especially connected was the anointing of the head and feet of our blessed Lord, in the house of Simon the leper. It was solemnly declared by our Lord that it was to be a memorial of her (Matt. xxvi. 13; Mark xiv. 9) wheresoever the gospel should be preached; and when St. John, writing two generations afterward, first mentions the name of the holy woman, he at once distinguishes her from every other Mary, as "that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair" (John xi. 2). After this holy scene, Mary

of Bethany passes away completely from our view.

4. The fourth Mary whose name appears in the Gospels is one about whose identification there is some difficulty, and with whom questions of the deepest interest have been associated. This Mary is mentioned by St. Matthew as one of the women who had followed our Lord from Galilee, and beheld, afar off, the crucifixion (Matt. xxvii. 55, 56). She is also mentioned by the evangelist as present at the burial of our Lord, and at the sepulchre on the morning of the resurrection, and is described as "the mother of James and Josés." She is similarly mentioned by St. Mark (Mark xv. 40), and is described as "the mother of James the Little and of Josés." In Luke (xxiv. 10) she is only mentioned as having gone to the sepulchre, and is described, more briefly, as "the [mother] of James." So far we have no difficulty. When we turn to John, we find mention of the holy women that stood by the cross, and in the following words, which we studiously leave without punctuation: "His mother and the sister of his mother Mary the [wife] of Clopas and Mary Magdalene." Now, before we notice the punctuation, we may consider this as clear,—that Mary, here described as "the [wife] of Clopas," is identical with the mother of James and Josés. But was she, or was she not, the sister of the Virgin? If she was, then the words, "Mary the [wife] of Clopas," must be considered as in apposition to, and as explanatory of, the unnamed "sister of his mother;" and we must conclude that no more than three persons are mentioned. If, however, she was not the sister of the Virgin, then there would be four persons, in two pairs,—two persons described and two definitely named. What is our decision to be? As we know that much hangs on it, it is, perhaps, difficult to judge with perfect impartiality. This, however, surely may be said,—that, as no one is elsewhere mentioned, in the whole gospel narrative, as "the sister of the Virgin," it seems difficult to believe that, in a passage in which it would seem clearly to be the desire of the inspired writer to be explicit in his mention of names, this insufficient designation should have been given of the pious woman referred to. It is only by comparison with the parallel passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark that we can obtain any means of identifying this sister of the Virgin. If she be not the wife of Clopas, she must apparently be "the mother of the sons of Zebedee" (Matt. xxvii. 56; comp. Mark xv. 40),—an iden-

tification to which Scripture does not elsewhere give any support.

If, on the contrary, we take what would seem to be the more natural connection of the clauses in the verse which we are now considering, we at once drift into the much-contested question of "the Lord's brethren." Into this it is obvious that we cannot enter in this paper; but this, at any rate, may be said: that great, confessedly, as would seem to be the difficulty arising from the apparent fact that each of two sisters had the same name, Mary, it seems a greater difficulty to suppose that the James and Joses who were the sons of the wife of Clopas are different persons from the James and Joses who are mentioned by St. Mark (Mark vi. 2) as two of our Lord's brethren. If we are prepared further to identify the name Alphaeus with Clopas,—and the arguments for this are certainly very strong,—we shall have the further fact that the Mary we are now considering was the mother of an Apostle. That she was also the mother of a second Apostle seems more doubtful, for the view of the Revised Version that the Apostle Jude was not the brother, but the son of James (Luke vi. 16), is certainly more probable than the contrary.

But we must proceed no further into the intricacies connected with the identifications involved in the keenly debated subject of the Lord's brethren. We have now done what we have attempted to do. We have cleared up, we hope, any passing difficulties that might be felt in regard of those who, in the gospel narrative, bear the name of Mary. The further difficulties that our results may be considered to involve belong fairly to a different and far more complicated subject.

HOW UNITARIANISM IS FARING IN JAPAN.

BY REV. ARTHUR MAY KNAPP.

From *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), Boston, March 30, 1890.

THE first Unitarian expedition to Japan, the "Mayflower" of by no means a forlorn hope, landed in this New England of the East on December 22, 1887. It found here a genial clime and a most hospitable reception. Its missionaries, if by any possible rehabilitation of a spoiled word they could be called such, were, like all missionaries in this fairy land, anything but martyrs. The atmosphere of universal kindness, peace, and good will here prevailing, makes expatriation the sole drawback to the pleasure of existence; and no resident foreigner,

even of the most moderate means, can with decency claim martyrdom on any other score.

This genial sky was, however, somewhat beclouded when two years afterward the second Unitarian expedition made its landing. Not that any change had been wrought in the disposition of the gentle islanders, but only that seventeen long years of the selfish and domineering policy of the strong Western powers (the attitude of the United States forming, I am glad to say, a conspicuous exception) had produced its legitimate result in something closely akin to an anti-foreign reaction, and there was danger that the Japanese would put away from their hearts the strangers to whom their hospitality had been before so charming in its genuineness and simplicity. Our second coming found the land in a ferment of political excitement. The pride of a profoundly self-respecting people just awakening to a consciousness of their newly acquired liberty and of the dignity of self-government had been deeply stirred by some of the provisions of the new treaties then being negotiated. On the very day previous to our landing, the excitement reached its culmination in the attempted assassination of Count Okuma, the minister for foreign affairs, and from that day until now the times have been exceedingly unpropitious for directing the attention of the Japanese to any subject save the absorbing one of politics. Apart from the purely political phases, the anti-foreign reaction has, however, been a healthful one, and one which all foreigners of discrimination should welcome rather than deplore. In their new-found life there was a too manifest tendency among the Japanese to ignore their own national individuality and to copy indiscriminately everything which belongs to Western life and ways. Now, Japanese individuality, and its preservation from the evil things of Western civilization, is the watchword of the Japanese patriot. Should this tendency triumph, as there are now strong reasons for believing, we may well rejoice even if along with the evils some of the better elements of our Western life be refused entrance here.

Happily for our own special errand, the immediate political excitement is now subsiding, and there is every indication that the time is at hand when the attention of this people may be wisely directed to the message which we have to bring.

Before this reaches the *Register*, there will have been a movement all along the line in the way of presenting that message.

The first number of the *Unitarian Zes-*

shi (magazine) is in press, and will appear on the first day of March, under more favorable auspices than has been the case with any similar publication ever issued in Japan. It will contain articles and cordial letters of greeting from Mr. Fukuzawa, Count Loyeshima, the vice-president of the Privy Council and the tutor of the emperor, Mr. Kato, the former president of the Imperial University, Mr. Nakamura, the most eminent Chinese scholar in the empire, and Mr. Lugiura, the leader of the moral movement among the students of the day. It is, of course, not to be claimed that all these men are Unitarians. Their interest and the great influence their names will exert have been obtained largely through considerations of personal friendship, and they have also been attracted by the liberality and catholicity of the prospectus of the magazine, which has been privately circulated among them. We fully realize that the future of the publication must depend largely upon our own efforts, while it will be our purpose to devote at least half of its pages to contributions from native sources. Many such contributions from men almost as eminent as those above mentioned are already promised us for future numbers. The fact of our having an article from Mr. Fukuzawa's pen in the first number is especially noteworthy. The extent and power of his influence over this people cannot be exaggerated. The pecuniary and other value to a publication of even a single word from him is so great, and he is so constantly besieged for such a word by the graduates of his institution, and by others who engage in literary ventures, that he is forced to make it a rigid rule to refuse every one. In our case, he has made this single and most notable exception, contributing, not merely a word, but an original and striking article bearing directly upon the interests of our movement. An editorial in the *Choya Shimibun*, a rival of the *Jiji Shimpō*, of which latter Mr. Fukuzawa is the editor, recently put this estimate upon the extent of Mr. Fukuzawa's influence: "The position he holds in the minds of this nation is higher than that of ministers of State; and he is to be greatly applauded for his known contempt for empty titles of nobility and other outward marks of distinction. That he possesses extraordinary capacity, the public knows already; but the public has still to learn that he is equally distinguished for magnanimity and chivalry."

Of Mr. Lugiura, whom our emphasis on character and morality has drawn strongly to our movement, and who contributes a

long article to our first number, the *Japan Mail* makes the following estimate: "He is now Assistant Director of the Bureau of Special Education in the Educational Department; but it is not in the line of official work that he shows himself greatest: it is in the unique position he holds toward the rising generation. There it is that he renders such excellent services to the country. A man of singular force of character, of keen intellect, and, above all, of sound common sense, he has attracted around him a circle of intelligent youths over whom he exercises a powerful influence."

The first number of the *Unitarian Zasshi* contains, besides the Introductory, an article by Mr. Hawkes, our English colleague, on "Unitarianism a Religion, not a Philosophy," one by Mr. MacCauley on "Unitarianism as a Moral Power," and one by the present writer on "Unitarianism as a Social Force," these being the three main departments, Religious, Ethical, and Social, which will constitute the make-up of future issues.

To-morrow there will appear in forty of the principal newspapers and periodicals of the empire the first advertisement of the publication, occupying a large and conspicuous space. In this advertisement, as also in another which follows a week later, there is displayed a statement of Unitarian Principles. Furthermore, on the inside of the cover of the magazine itself, directly over the table of contents, there will be kept as a standing notice in every number the following statement, which the exigencies of the case have made it necessary to express with telegraphic brevity:—

UNITARIAN PRINCIPLES.

Fundamentals.

On which all Unitarians are agreed.

I. *Basis*.—Not traditional authority, but rational and scientific truth.

II. *Method*.—Perfect Freedom of Inquiry.

III. *Aim*.—The highest development of Humanity, personal and social.

Beliefs commonly held by Unitarians.

1. In *Religion* as the natural and necessary expression of man's relations to God and Duty.

2. In *Christianity* as that form of Religion which in its purity teaches simply the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

3. I
Power
the U
opmen
4.
devel
be cal
5.
writin
error,
natur
6.
who
devel
7.
thoug
the s
end.
It
conn
mag
Arak
of M
It m
adv
path
into
sias
A
tere
mag
know
men
her
sibl
to j
as
put
for
C
sim
per
bu
wil
fice
gro
ha
fro
ut
tu
di
es
ua
sn
be
lo
R
on
a
w
p

3. In God as the Infinite and Eternal Power, Wisdom, and Beneficence, guiding the Universe by a process of natural development.

4. In *Man* as the highest result of such development, who by his exalted nature may be called the Child of God.

5. In the *Bible* as a collection of human writings, containing, though mixed with error, the best expression of man's religious nature.

6. In *Jesus* as the greatest of the teachers who have guided mankind in their religious development.

7. In the *Fellowship of Religions*, since, though differing in excellence, they have the same source and substantially the same end.

It is an interesting fact to be stated in connection with the publication of the magazine that our Japanese managers, Mr. Arakawa and Mr. Itaya, were both members of Mr. Sunderland's church at Ann Arbor. It may easily be conceived that it is no small advantage for us that they are fully in sympathy with our errand, and that they enter into our plans with a corresponding enthusiasm.

Another feature of special theological interest is the fact that the new Unitarian magazine is based upon and forced to acknowledge the doctrine of vicarious atonement. The exigencies of the press laws here require that some one shall be responsible to the government and be ready to go to jail in case of such a violation of the laws as may require so extreme a measure to be put into force. A go-to-jail editor is therefore duly provided for.

Of the other lines of work to be opened simultaneously with the publication of our periodical it is not my purpose to write now, but to wait until the next mail, when they will have become accomplished facts. Suffice it to say at present that our corps, greatly strengthened and stimulated as it has lately been by the arrival of Mr. Hawkes from England, is working together with the utmost harmony; that a large hall for lectures and addresses has been placed at our disposal free of charge by one of our Japanese friends; that a building admirably situated, and containing class-rooms and a smaller hall, having been purchased, is now being fitted up for our purposes; and that long before this reaches the readers of the *Register* Unitarianism will have become an organized force among the influences which are now shaping the destinies of this wonderful land, this gentle and kindly people.

A MONSTROUS JUDICIAL DECISION: THE BIBLE UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

From *The Advance* (Congregationalist), Chicago, March 27, 1890.

THE decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, declaring the presence of the Bible in a public school in that State "unconstitutional," seems to us a narrow and monstrous construction, a piece of judicial sectarian atheism, unwarranted by the facts and the law, contrary to the highest judicial precedents, and at war with the good of our system of public schools.

No one now questions the necessity of keeping the public school in every proper sense of the term unsectarian. To teach officially in the common school the special doctrines which separated the religious sects from one another is obviously improper under our system of schools. But to say that the Bible itself, without note or comment, the one book that is common to all Christendom is, in the United States, itself sectarian and unconstitutional, is to exalt the sectarianism of atheism into the place of the Constitution.

The State of Wisconsin was originally a part of the "Northwestern Territory," the bottom-most law of which was, and is, that glorious Ordinance of July 13, 1787, article 3rd, of which reads: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government, and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Did the term "religion," as used in that fundamental law, mean atheism or heathenism? Or did it contemplate that the Bible itself was the one book of the world to be judicially put under taboo, banished and ruled out of the schools for which, according to that illustrious Ordinance, every sixteenth quarter-section in the entire Territory was to be set apart for educational purposes?

Judge Story, in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," speaking of the meaning of the amendment to the Constitution relating to this matter, says:

"Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it, now under consideration, the general if not the universal sentiment in America was that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the State, so far as it is not incompatible with the private rights of conscience and the freedom of religious worship.

"An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of State policy to hold all

in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation.

"The real object of the amendment was, not to countenance, much less to advance, Mahometanism, or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to any hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the National Government."

The particular case at issue in Wisconsin, is that known as the Edgerton Bible case. It had been customary for teachers in the schools in the township of Edgerton to read from the Bible at the opening of the school each morning, using the common English version. Some of the Roman Catholic parents, prompted no doubt by the priests, protested against this, and appealed to the Circuit Court for a writ of mandamus to compel the School Board to put a stop to the practice.

The Circuit Court under the ruling of Judge Bennett declined to grant the writ. The case on appeal came before the Supreme Court of the State, with the result mentioned above. Judge Lyon, who wrote the formal opinion, deals directly with the question, whether the reading of the Bible is "sectarian instruction." Says Judge Lyon:

"The term 'sectarian instruction' in the Constitution manifestly refers exclusively to instruction in religious doctrines which are believed by some religious sects and rejected by others. Hence to teach the existence of a Supreme Being of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, and that it is the highest duty of all men to adore, obey, and love him, is not sectarian, because all religious sects so believe and teach.

"The instruction becomes sectarian when it goes further and inculcates doctrine or dogma concerning which the religious sects are in conflict. This we understand to be the meaning of the constitutional prohibition. That the reading of the Bible in the schools, although unaccompanied by any comment on the part of the teacher, is instruction seems to us too clear for argument. Some of the most valuable instruction a person can receive may be derived from reading alone, without any aid by way of comment or exposition. The question therefore seems to narrow down to this: Is the reading of the Bible in the schools—not merely selected passages therefrom but the whole of it—sectarian instruction of the pupils? In view of the fact already men-

tioned, that the Bible contains numerous doctrinal passages upon some of which the peculiar creed of almost every religious sect is based, and that such passages may reasonably be understood to inculcate the doctrines predicated upon them, an affirmative answer to the question seems unavoidable. Any pupil of ordinary intelligence who listens to the reading of the doctrinal portions of the Bible will be more or less instructed thereby in the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ, the eternal punishment of the wicked, the authority of the priesthood, the binding force and efficacy of the sacraments, and many other conflicting sectarian doctrines."

This is to say, the Bible, though the book common to all the sects, is such a book that a pupil, if not an idiot, listening to the reading of it might be liable to be "more or less instructed thereby" and get some *impressions of his own* as to doctrines contained in it; therefore, it must be ruled out of the public schools of the State as "unconstitutional."

But if this monstrous judicial doctrine be accepted, what then will become of the text-books founded upon the fundamental teachings of the Bible? Must these be utterly expurgated and flattened out into sheer paganism or complete agnosticism as regards all the spiritual necessities and interests of our nature? No, not quite that. It is not necessary to "banish from the district schools such text-books as are founded upon the fundamental teachings of the Bible or which contain extracts therefrom; and there is much in the Bible which cannot justly be characterized as sectarian, and there can be no valid objection to the use of such matter in the secular instructions of the pupils. Much of it has great historical and literary value which may be thus utilized without violating the constitutional prohibition. It may also be utilized to inculcate good morals—that is, our duties to each other—which may and ought to be inculcated by the district schools."

So it will be some satisfaction to good people in the freedom-loving State of Wisconsin, to learn from their Supreme Court that their schools need not be quite reduced to utter immorality as well as absolute irreligiousness.

But Justice Cassoday, of the same Court, in his separate opinion makes another point. The Bible must not be read in a public school; for, if read before the pupils, it might, in some cases at least, awaken some

sentim
"holy
and ho
tutes
that, i
school
soday
"Co

tures
dience
therei
ual, o
public
worsh
text
ceded
Script
thoug
The
praye
possib
Chris
espec
with
ratio
which
must
Bible
may
clau
tion

In
pub
pret
the
and
are,
hon
V
sch
the
bea
app

sic
it
ha
po
me
the
na
th
Pa
ca
se
ha
ti
H
w
to
co

sentiments kindred to worship; such a "holy sense of honor, reverence, adoration, and homage to Almighty God," as constitutes "the very essence of worship." And that, it seems, would be dreadful in a public school. These are the words of Judge Cassoday in his opinion:

"Certainly the reading of the holy Scriptures as the eternal word of God, in obedience to the often repeated injunction therein contained, whether by the individual, or privately, or in the family, or in the public assembly, is an essential part of divine worship. Every sermon is based upon some text of Scripture. Most prayers are preceded by the reading of some passage of Scripture as an intelligent guide to the thoughts of the worshipper or worshippers. The Sermon on the Mount contains the prayer taught by the blessed Lord. Is it possible for any genuine believer in the Christian religion to read that sermon, and especially that prayer, without being filled with a holy sense of honor, reverence, adoration, and homage to Almighty God? which is the very essence of worship. We must hold that the stated reading of the Bible in the public schools as a text-book may be worship within the meaning of the clause of the Constitution under consideration."

In short, it therefore comes to this in the public school system of Wisconsin, as interpreted by its astute Supreme Court, that the two things to be tabooed and banished and forever kept out of the public schools, are, the idea of God and any "holy sense of honor and reverence to Almighty God!"

Well, if this is what our American public school system has come to, or is coming to, the fact should be known, and the necessary bearings and tremendous significance of it appreciated.

The Bible may at any rate rank as a classic in the world's literature. Nobody thinks it a bad book. It is commonly supposed to have some value from a historic and literary point of view. It has unquestionably had more to do in determining the literature and the laws and the social life of the progressive nations than any other book, if not more than all other books put together. The President of the United States takes his oath of office with a more or less "holy sense of honor and reverence," with his hand placed on this book. All our legislative bodies from the National Senate and House of Representatives down, are opened with prayer. Last year, when the first centennial of the National Constitution was celebrated in a national way, with most im-

posing ceremonies, the formal celebration was opened with prayer. The spirit of liberty is commonly supposed to be the glory of our American institutions. The public school is declared to be "the sheet anchor of the ship of State." But in the public school—according to the opinion of Wisconsin's Supreme Court—the two things to be forever prohibited, scared off and barred out of the public school are, the Bible and "the holy sense of honor and reverence" toward God.

The Legislature of Georgia, two or three years ago, came near passing what was called "the chain-gang law," to the effect that if any teacher in any school in that State should allow a white pupil in a school along with colored pupils, he might be punished with a year's consignment to the chain-gang. As to a teacher in a Wisconsin school who might like to read a few verses from the Bible, he need not be sent to the chain-gang, but he must be gagged. And if this law hold in the public school, it must also hold in the State University and in the State Normal Schools. And all this, in the interests of a "sectarian" atheism.

If, hereafter, in the State of Wisconsin, the public schools, including the Normal Schools and the State University, are not actually made to be what Romanists have all along tried to make them out to be, absolutely and positively godless, it will be no fault of this decision of Judges Lyon, Cassoday and Orton. It should be added that a similar decision has never been rendered by any Supreme Court in any other State in the Union. This case is at any rate certain to be notorious. But what has this one particular Book done for America, or, let it be added, for the State of Wisconsin, that its chief judiciary should thus unite in pronouncing it an unfit and "unconstitutional" book to be read in the hearing of the children and youth of that State in the public schools? And is it, as Judge Cassoday suggests, such a dreadful thing to inculcate in the youth of our time a "holy sense of honor and reverence"? Is that the rock on which the youth of Wisconsin are in special danger of personal shipwreck?

Such a narrow and strained and tortured construction of the law is sheer pettifoggery; it lacks the first element of judicial decency.

DRUG CLERK (briskly): Insect powder? Yes, ma'am. Here's some Swedish insect powder that's highly recommended.

CUSTOMER: I don't know whether that will work. Mine are plain, American insects.

VI.

CHRISTIANITY AND AGNOSTICISM.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.

(Continued from the April number, p. 53.)

incredible that no old traditions of our Lord's teaching should have existed beyond those which are common to the three Gospels. St. Luke, in fact, in that preface which Prof. Huxley has no hesitation in using for his own purposes, says that "many had taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us;" but Prof. Huxley asks us to assume that none of these records were old, and none trustworthy, but that particular one which furnishes a sort of skeleton to the first three Gospels. There is no evidence whatever, beyond Prof. Huxley's private judgment, for such an assumption. Nay, he himself tells us that, according to Holtzmann, it is at present a "burning question" among critics "whether the relatively primitive narration and the root of the other synoptic texts is contained in Matthew or in Mark."* Yet while his own authority tells him that this is a burning question, he treats it as settled in favor of St. Mark, "beyond any rational doubt or dispute," and employs this assumption as sufficiently solid ground on which to rest his doubts of the genuineness of the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer!

But let us pass to another point in Prof. Huxley's mode of argument. Let us grant, again, for the sake of argument, his *non sequitur* that the second Gospel is the nearest extant representative of the oldest tradition. "How comes it," he asks, "that it contains neither the Sermon on the Mount nor the Lord's Prayer?" Well, that is a very interesting inquiry, which has, in point of fact, often been considered by Christian divines; and various answers are conceivable, equally reasonable and sufficient. If it was St. Mark's object to record our Lord's acts rather than his teaching, what right has Prof. Huxley, from his purely human point of view, to find fault with him? If, from a Christian point of view, St. Mark was inspired by a divine guidance to present the most vivid, brief, and effective sketch possible of our Lord's action as a Saviour, and for that purpose to leave to another writer the description of our Lord as a teacher, the phenomenon is not less satisfactorily explained. St. Mark, according to, that tra-

dition of the Church which Prof. Huxley believes to be quite worthless, but which his authority Holtzmann does not, was in great measure the mouth-piece of St. Peter. Now, St. Peter is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, in his address to Cornelius, as summing up our Lord's life in these words: "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all who were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him;" and this is very much the point of view represented in St. Mark's Gospel. When, in fact, Prof. Huxley asks, in answer to Holtzmann, who is again unfavorable to his views, "What conceivable motive could Mark have for omitting it?"* the answers that arise are innumerable. Perhaps, as has been suggested, St. Mark was more concerned with acts than words; perhaps he wanted to be brief; perhaps he was writing for persons who wanted one kind of record and not another; and, above all, perhaps it was not so much a question of "omission" as of selection. It is really astonishing that this latter consideration never seems to cross the mind of Prof. Huxley and writers like him. The Gospels are among the briefest biographies in the world. I have sometimes thought that there is evidence of something superhuman about them in the mere fact that, while human biographers labor through volumes in order to give us some idea of their subject, every one of the Gospels, occupying no more than a chapter or two in length of an ordinary biography, nevertheless gives us an image of our Lord sufficiently vivid to have made him the living companion of all subsequent generations. But if "the gospel of Jesus Christ" was to be told within the compass of the sixteen chapters of St. Mark, some selection had to be made out of the mass of our Lord's words and deeds as recorded by the tradition of those "who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word." The very greatness and effectiveness of these four Gospels consist in this wonderful power of selection, like that by which a great artist depicts a character and a figure in half a dozen touches; and Prof. Huxley may, perhaps, to put the matter on its lowest level, find out a conceivable motive for St. Mark's omissions when he can produce such an effective narrative as St. Mark's. As St. John says at the end of his Gospel, "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself

could
writte
to mal
omissi
But
anyth
suppo
is the
autho
life of
John
well
life of
wrote
the a
was r
me so
ticles
but
To ta
Lul
necte
under
"Ma
have
ment
does
of th
not c
small
conce
work
let a
I
on t
con
of M
But
nor
Gos
uin
no
wri
lon
hin
dis
giv
of
ly
do
spi
tag
so
alt
so
hi
wi
hi
we
G
th
an
an

could not contain the books that should be written." So St. John, like St. Mark, had to make his selection, and selection involves omission.

But, after all, I venture to ask whether anything can be more preposterous than this supposition that because a certain tradition is the oldest authority, therefore every other authority is discredited? Boswell writes a life of Johnson; therefore every record of Johnson's acts or words which is not in Boswell is to be suspected. Carlyle writes a life of Sterling first, and Archdeacon Hare writes one afterward; therefore nothing in the archdeacon's life is to be trusted which was not also in Carlyle's. What seems to me so astonishing about Prof. Huxley's articles is not the wildness of their conclusions, but the rottenness of their ratiocination. To take another instance:

Luke either knew the collection of loosely connected and aphoristic utterances which appear under the name of the "Sermon on the Mount" in "Matthew," or he did not. If he did not, he must have been ignorant of the existence of such a document as our canonical "Matthew," a fact which does not make for the genuineness or the authority of that book. If he did, he has shown that he does not care for its authority on a matter of fact of no small importance; and that does not permit us to conceive that he believed the first Gospel to be the work of an authority to whom he ought to defer, let alone that of an apostolic eye-witness.

I pass by the description of the Sermon on the Mount as a "collection of loosely connected utterances," though it is a kind of begging of a very important question. But supposing St. Luke to have been ignorant of the existence of St. Matthew's Gospel, how does this reflect on the genuineness of that book unless we know, as no one does, that St. Matthew's Gospel was written before St. Luke's, and sufficiently long before it to have become known to him? Or, if he did know it, where is the disrespect to its authority in his having given for his own purposes an abridgment of that which St. Matthew gave more fully? Prof. Huxley might almost seem dominated by the mechanical theory of inspiration which he denounces in his antagonists. He writes as if there were something absolutely sacred, neither to be altered nor added to, in the mere words of some old authority of which he conceives himself to be in possession. Dr. Abbott, with admirable labor, has had printed for him, in clear type, the words or bits of words which are common to the first three Gospels, and he seems immediately to adopt the anathema of the book of Revelation, and to proclaim to every man, evangelist and apostles included, "if any man shall

add unto these things, . . . and if any man shall take away from the words" of this "common tradition" of Dr. Abbott, he shall be forthwith scientifically excommunicated. I venture to submit, as a mere matter of common sense, that if three persons used one document, it is the height of rashness to conclude that it contained nothing but what they all three quote; that it is not only possible but probable that, while certain parts were used by all, each may have used some parts as suitable to his own purpose which the others did not find suitable to theirs; and, lastly, that the fact of there having been one such document in existence is so far from being evidence that there were no others, that it even creates some presumption that there were. In short, I must beg leave to represent, not so much that Prof. Huxley's conclusions are wrong, but that there is absolutely no validity in the reasoning by which he endeavors to support them. It is not, in fact, reasoning at all, but mere presumption and guess-work, inconsistent, moreover, with all experience and common sense.

Of course, if Prof. Huxley's quibbles against the Sermon on the Mount go to pieces, so do his cavils at the authenticity of the Lord's Prayer; and, indeed, on these two points I venture to think that the case for which I was contending is carried by the mere fact that it seems necessary to Prof. Huxley's position to dispute them. If he cannot maintain his ground without pushing his agnosticism to such a length as to deny the substantial genuineness of the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, I think he will be found to have allowed enough to satisfy reasonable men that his case must be a bad one. I shall not, therefore, waste more time on these points, as I must say something on his strange treatment of the third point in the evangelical records to which I referred, the story of the Passion. It is really difficult to take seriously what he says on this subject. He says:

I am not quite sure what Dr. Wace means by this—I am not aware that any one (with the exception of certain ancient heretics) has propounded doubts as to the reality of the crucifixion; and certainly I have no inclination to argue about the precise accuracy of every detail of that pathetic story of suffering and wrong. But if Dr. Wace means, as I suppose he does, that that which, according to the orthodox view, happened after the crucifixion, and which is, in a dogmatic sense, the most important part of the story, is founded on solid historical proofs, I must beg leave to express a diametrically opposite conviction.

Prof. Huxley is not quite sure what I mean by the story of the Passion, but sup-

poses I mean the story of the resurrection ! It is barely credible that he can have supposed anything of the kind ; but by this gratuitous supposition he has again evaded the issue I proposed to him, and has shifted the argument to another topic, which, however important in itself, is entirely irrelevant to the particular point in question. If he really supposed that when I said the Passion I meant the resurrection, it is only another proof of his incapacity for strict argument, at least on these subjects. I not only used the expression " the story of the Passion," but I explicitly stated in my reply to him for what purpose I appealed to it. I said that " that story involves the most solemn attestation, again and again, of truths of which an agnostic coolly says he knows nothing ;" and I mentioned particularly our Lord's final utterance, " Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," as conveying our Lord's attestation in his death agony to his relation to God as his Father. That exclamation is recorded by St. Luke ; but let me remind the reader of what is recorded by St. Mark, upon whom Prof. Huxley mainly relies. There we have the account of the agony in Gethsemane and of our Lord's prayer to his Father ; we have the solemn challenge of the highpriest, " Art thou the Christ, the son of the Blessed ?" and our Lord's reply, " I am ; and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," with his immediate condemnation, on the ground that in this statement he had spoken blasphemy. On the cross, moreover, St. Mark records his affecting appeal to his Father, " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" All this solemn evidence Prof. Huxley puts aside with the mere passing observation that he has " no inclination to argue about the precise accuracy of every detail of that pathetic story of suffering and wrong." But these prayers and declarations of our Lord are not mere details ; they are of the very essence of the story of the Passion ; and whether Prof. Huxley is inclined to argue about them or not, he will find that all serious people will be influenced by them to the end of time, unless they be shown to be unhistorical.

At all events, by refusing to consider their import, Prof. Huxley has again, in the most flagrant manner, evaded my challenge. I not only mentioned specifically " the story of the Passion," but I explained what I meant by it ; and Prof. Huxley asks us to believe that he does not understand what I referred to ; he refuses to face that story ; and he raises an irrelevant issue about the

resurrection. It is irrelevant, because the point specifically at issue between us is not the truth of the Christian creed, but the meaning of agnosticism, and the responsibilities which agnosticism involves. I say that whether agnosticism be justifiable or not, it involves a denial of the beliefs in which Jesus lived and died. It would equally involve a denial of them had he never risen ; and if Prof. Huxley really thinks, therefore, that a denial of the resurrection affects the evidence afforded by the Passion, he must be incapable of distinguishing between two successive and entirely distinct occurrences.

But the manner in which Prof. Huxley has treated this irrelevant issue deserves perhaps a few words, for it is another characteristic specimen of his mode of argument. I note, by the way, that, after referring to " the facts of the case as stated by the oldest extant narrative of them"—he means the story in St. Mark, though this is not a part of that common tradition of the three Gospels on which he relies ; for, as he observes, the accounts in St. Matthew and St. Luke present marked variations from it—he adds :

I do not see why any one should have a word to say against the inherent probability of that narrative ; and, for my part, I am quite ready to accept it as an historical fact, that so much and no more is positively known of the end of Jesus of Nazareth.

We have, then, the important admission that Prof. Huxley has not a word to say against the historic credibility of the narrative in the fifteenth chapter of St. Mark, and accordingly he proceeds to quote its statements for the purpose of his argument. That argument, in brief, is that our Lord might very well have survived his crucifixion, have been removed still living to the tomb, have been taken out of it on the Friday or Saturday night by Joseph of Arimathea, and have recovered and found his way to Galilee. So much Prof. Huxley is prepared to believe, and he asks " on what grounds can a reasonable man be asked to believe any more ?" But a prior question is on what grounds can a reasonable man be asked to believe as much as this ? In the first place, if St. Mark's narrative is to be the basis of discussion, why does Prof. Huxley leave out of account the scourging, with the indication of weakness in our Lord's ability to bear his cross, and treat him as exposed to crucifixion in the condition simply of " temperate, strong men, such as the ordinary Galilean peasants were" ? In the next place, I am informed by good medical authority that he is quite mistaken in saying that " no serious physical symptoms need at once arise from

the w
and f
grave
the c
woun
them
Prof.
ing o
of bl
is so
true
Marl
witr
But,
matt
chur
liber
Loré
to w
that
coun
ley a
furl
deed
natu
mea
ques
earl
our
that
havi
he c
the
plai
the
Jose
ley's
Gos
easi
out
asse
the
jud
suc
to c
issu
poi
wit
me
lies
Pat
A
of h
qua
wit
" p
of f
a v
lon
"
vis

the wounds made by the nails in the hands and feet," and that, on the contrary, very grave symptoms would ordinarily arise in the course of no long time from such severe wounds, left to fester, with the nails in them, for six hours. In the third place, Prof. Huxley takes no account of the piercing of our Lord's side, and of the appearance of blood and water from the wound, which is solemnly attested by one witness. It is true that incident is not recorded by St. Mark; but Prof. Huxley must disprove the witness before he can leave it out of account. But, lastly, if Prof. Huxley's account of the matter be true, the first preaching of the church must have been founded on a deliberate fraud, of which some at least of our Lord's most intimate friends were guilty, or to which they were accessory; and I thought that supposition was practically out of account among reasonable men. Prof. Huxley argues as if he had only to deal with the further evidence of St. Paul. That, indeed, is evidence of a far more momentous nature than he recognizes; but it is by no means the most important. It is beyond question that the Christian society, from the earliest moment of its existence, believed in our Lord's resurrection. Baur frankly says that there is no doubt about the church having been founded on this belief, though he cannot explain how the belief arose. If the resurrection be a fact, the belief is explained; but it is certainly not explained by the supposition of a fraud on the part of Joseph of Arimathea. As to Prof. Huxley's assertion that the accounts in the three Gospels are "hopelessly discrepant," it is easily made and as easily denied; but it is out of all reason that Prof. Huxley's bare assertion on such a point should outweigh the opinions of some of the most learned judges of evidence, who have thought no such thing. It would be absurd to attempt to discuss that momentous story as a side issue in a review. It is enough to have pointed out that Prof. Huxley discusses it without even taking into account the statements of the very narrative on which he relies. The manner in which he sets aside St. Paul is equally reckless:

According to his own showing, Paul, in the vigor of his manhood, with every means of becoming acquainted, at first hand, with the evidence of eye-witnesses, not merely refused to credit them, but "persecuted the Church of God and made havoc of it." . . . Yet this strange man, because he has a vision one day, at once, and with equally headlong zeal, flies to the opposite pole of opinion.

"A vision!" The whole question is, what vision? How can Prof. Huxley be sure

that no vision could be of such a nature as to justify a man in acting on it? If, as we are told, our Lord personally appeared to St. Paul, spoke to him, and gave him specific commands, was he to disbelieve his own eyes and ears, as well as his own conscience, and go up to Jerusalem to cross-examine Peter and John and James? If the vision was a real one he was at once under orders, and had to obey our Lord's injunctions. It is, to say the least, rash, if not presumptuous, for Prof. Huxley to declare that such a vision as St. Paul had would not have convinced him; and, at all events, the question is not disposed of by calling the manifestation "a vision." Two things are certain about St. Paul. One is that he was in the confidence of the Pharisees, and was their trusted agent in persecuting the Christians; and the other is that he was afterward in the confidence of the apostles, and knew all their side of the case. He holds, therefore, the unique position of having had equal access to all that would be alleged on both sides; and the result is that, being fully acquainted with all that the Pharisees could urge against the resurrection, he nevertheless gave up his whole life to attesting its truth, and threw in his lot, at the cost of martyrdom, with those whom he had formerly persecuted. Prof. Huxley reminds us that he did all this in the full vigor of manhood, and in spite of strong and even violent prejudices. This is not a witness to be put aside in Prof. Huxley's off-hand manner.

But the strangest part of Prof. Huxley's article remains to be noticed; and, so far as the main point at issue between us is concerned, I need hardly have noticed anything else. He proceeds to a long and intricate discussion, quite needless, as I think, for his main object, respecting the relations between the Nazarenes, Ebionites, Jewish and Gentile Christians, first in the time of Justin Martyr and then of St. Paul. Into this discussion, in the course of which he makes assumptions which, as Holtzmann will tell him, are as much questioned by the German criticism on which he relies as by English theologians, it is unnecessary for me to follow him. The object of it is to establish a conclusion, which is all with which I am concerned. That conclusion is that "if the primitive Nazarenes of whom the Acts speak were orthodox Jews, what sort of probability can there be that Jesus was anything else?"* But what more is necessary for the purpose of my argument? To say, indeed,

that this *a priori* probability places us "in a position to form a safe judgment of the limits within which the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth must have been confined," is to beg a great question, for it assumes that our Lord could not have transcended those limits unless his disciples transcended them simultaneously with him. But if our Lord's beliefs were those of an orthodox Jew, we certainly know enough of them to be quite sure that they involved a denial of Prof. Huxley's agnosticism. An orthodox Jew certainly believed in God, and in his responsibility to God, and in a divine revelation and a divine law. It is, says Prof. Huxley, "extremely probable" that he appealed "to those noble conceptions of religion which constituted the pith and kernel of the teaching of the great prophets of his nation seven hundred years earlier." But, if so, his first principles involved the assertion of religious realities which an agnostic refuses to acknowledge. Prof. Huxley has, in fact, dragged his readers through this thorny question of Jewish and Gentile Christianity in order to establish, at the end of it, and, as it seems, quite unconsciously, an essential part of the very allegation which I originally made. I said that a person who "knows nothing" of God asserts the belief of Jesus of Nazareth to have been unfounded, repudiates his example, and denies his authority. Prof. Huxley, in order to answer this contention, offers to prove, with great elaboration, that Jesus was an orthodox Jew, and consequently that his belief did involve what an agnostic rejects. How much beyond these elementary truths Jesus taught is a further and a distinct question. What I was concerned to maintain is that a man cannot be an agnostic with respect to even the elementary truths of religion without rejecting the example and authority of Jesus Christ; and Prof. Huxley, though he still endeavors to avoid facing the fact, has established it by a roundabout method of his own.

I suppose I must also reply to Prof. Huxley's further challenge respecting my belief in the story of the Gadarene swine, though the difficulty of which he makes so much seems to me too trivial to deserve serious notice. He says "there are two stories, one in 'Mark' and 'Luke,' and the other in 'Matthew.'" In the former there is one possessed man, in the latter there are two," and he asks me which I believe? My answer is that I believe both, and that the supposition of there being any inconsistency between them can only arise on that mechanical view of inspiration from which

Prof. Huxley seems unable to shake himself free. Certainly "the most unabashed of reconcilers cannot well say that one man is the same as two, or two as one;" but no one need be abashed to say that the greater number includes the less, and that if two men met our Lord, one certainly did. If I go into the operating theatre of King's College Hospital, and see an eminent surgeon perform a new or rare operation on one or two patients, and if I tell a friend afterward that I saw the surgeon perform such and such an operation on a patient, will he feel in any perplexity if he meets another spectator half an hour afterward who says he saw the operation performed on two patients? All that I should have been thinking of was the nature of the operation, which is as well described by reference to one patient as to half a dozen; and similarly St. Mark and St. Luke may have thought that the only important point was the nature of the miracle itself, and not the number of possessed men who were the subjects of it. It is quite unnecessary, therefore, for me to consider all the elaborate dilemmas in which Prof. Huxley would entangle me respecting the relative authority of the first three Gospels. As two includes one, and as both witnesses are in my judgment equally to be trusted, I adopt the supposition which includes the statements of both. It is a pure assumption that inspiration requires verbal accuracy in the reporting of every detail, and an assumption quite inconsistent with our usual tests of truth. Just as no miracle has saved the texts of the Scriptures from corruption in secondary points, so no miracle has been wrought to exclude the ordinary variations of truthful reporters in the Gospel narratives. But a miracle, in my belief, has been wrought in inspiring four men to give, within the compass of their brief narratives, such a picture of the life and work and teaching, of the death and resurrection, of the Son of man as to illuminate all human existence for the future, and to enable men "to believe that Jesus is the Christ, and believing to have life through his name."

It is with different feelings from those which Prof. Huxley provokes that I turn for a while to Mrs. Humphry Ward's article on "The New Reformation." Since he adopts that article as a sufficient confutation of mine, I feel obliged to notice it, though I am sorry to appear in any position of antagonism to its author. Apart from other considerations, I am under much obligation to Mrs. Ward for the valuable series of articles which she contributed to

the
unde
inter
I tru
upon
scrip
descri
of h
cially
sider
can
ques
"a
dice
pres
hope
confi
tant
slur
been
by G
thein
Hux
theo
"V
ago,
year
tena
in h
of E
How
waiv
Mrs
me
refu
at l
her,
pose
Ger
of M
mon
stat
crit
led
fail
left
only
Wa
sum
a re
den
the
not
on
pro
suc
from
agi
ert
pre
bei

the "Dictionary of Christian Biography" under my editorship, upon the obscure but interesting history of the Goths in Spain. I trust that, in her account of the effect upon Robert Elsmere and Merriman of absorption in that barbarian scene, she is not describing her own experience and the source of her own aberrations. But I feel especially bound to treat her argument with consideration, and to waive any opposition which can be avoided. I am sorry that she, too, questions the possibility in this country of "a scientific, that is to say, an unprejudiced, an unbiassed study of theology, under present conditions," and I should have hoped that she would have had too much confidence in her colleagues in the important work to which I refer than to cast this slur upon them. Their labors have, in fact, been received with sufficient appreciation by German scholars of all schools to render their vindication unnecessary; and if Prof. Huxley can extend his study of German theological literature much beyond Zeller's "Vorträge" of "a quarter of a century ago," or Ritschl's writings of "nearly forty years ago," he will not find himself countenanced by church historians in Germany in his contempt for the recent contributions of English scholars to early church history. However, it is the more easy for me to waive all differences of this nature with Mrs. Ward, because it is unnecessary for me to look beyond her article for its own refutation. Her main contention, or that at least for which Prof. Huxley appeals to her, seems to be that it is a mistake to suppose that the rationalistic movement of Germany has been defeated in the sphere of New Testament criticism, and she selects more particularly for her protest a recent statement in the *Quarterly Review* that this criticism, and particularly the movement led by Baur, is "an attack which has failed." The *Quarterly Reviewer* may be left to take care of himself; but I would only ask what is the evidence which Mrs. Ward adduces to the contrary? It may be summed up in two words—a prophecy and a romance. She does not adduce any evidence that the Tübingen school, which is the one we are chiefly concerned with, did not fail to establish its specific contentions; on the contrary, she says that "history protested," and she goes on to prophesy the success of other speculations which arose from that protest, concluding with an imaginary sketch, like that with which "Robert Elsmere" ends, of a "new Reformation preparing, struggling into utterance and being, all around us. . . . It is close upon

us—it is prepared by all the forces of history and mind—its rise sooner or later is inevitable." This is prophecy, but it is not argument; and a little attention to Mrs. Ward's own statements will exhibit a very different picture. The Christian representative in her dialogue exclaims:

What is the whole history of German criticism but a series of brilliant failures, from Strauss downward? One theorist follows another—now Mark is uppermost as the Ur-Evangelist, now Matthew—now the Synoptics are sacrificed to St. John, now St. John to the Synoptics. Baur relegates one after another of the Epistles to the second century because his theory cannot do with them in the first. Harnack tells you that Baur's theory is all wrong, and that Thessalonians and Philippians must go back again. Volkmar sweeps together Gospels and Epistles in a heap toward the middle of the second century as the earliest date for almost all of them; and Dr. Abbott, who, as we are told, has absorbed all the learning of the Germans, puts Mark before 70 A.D., Matthew just about 70 A.D., and Luke about 80 A.D.; Strauss's mythical theory is dead and buried by common consent; Baur's tendency theory is much the same; Renan will have none of the Tübingen school; Volkmar is already antiquated; and Pfleiderer's fancies are now in the order of the day.

A better statement could hardly be wanted of what is meant by an attack having failed, and now let the reader observe how Merriman in the dialogue meets it. Does he deny any of those allegations? Not one. "Very well," he says, "let us leave the matter there for the present. Suppose we go to the Old Testament;" and then he proceeds to dwell on the concessions made to the newest critical school of Germany by a few distinguished English divines at the last Church Congress. I must, indeed, dispute her representation of that rather one-sided debate as amounting to "a collapse of English orthodoxy," or as justifying her statement that "the Church of England practically gives its verdict" in favor, for instance, of the school which regards the Pentateuch or the Hexateuch as "the peculiar product of that Jewish religious movement which, beginning with Josiah, . . . yields its final fruits long after the exile." Not only has the Church of England given no such verdict, but German criticism has as yet given no such verdict. For example, in the introduction to the Old Testament by one of the first Hebrew scholars of Germany, Prof. Hermann Strack, contained in the valuable "Hand-book of the Theological Sciences," edited, with the assistance of several distinguished scholars, by Prof. Zöcher, I find, at page 215 of the third edition, published this year, the following brief summary of what, in Dr. Strack's opinion, is the result of the controversy so far:

The future results of further labors in the field of Pentateuch criticism cannot, of course, be predicted in particulars. But, in spite of the great assent which the view of Graf and Wellhausen at present enjoys, we are nevertheless convinced that it will not permanently lead to any essential alteration in the conception which has hitherto prevailed of the history of Israel, and in particular of the work of Moses. On the other hand, one result will certainly remain, that the Pentateuch was not composed by Moses himself, but was compiled by later editors from various original sources. . . . But the very variety of these sources may be applied in favor of the credibility of the Pentateuch.

In other words, it may be said that Dr. Strack regards it as established that "The Law of Moses" is a title of the same character as "The Psalms of David," the whole collection being denominated from its principal author. But he is convinced that the general conclusions of the prevalent school of Old Testament criticism, which involve an entire subversion of our present conceptions of Old Testament history, will not be maintained. In the face of this opinion, it does not seem presumptuous to express an apprehension that the younger school of Hebrew scholars in England, of whose concessions Mrs. Ward makes so much, have gone too far and too fast; and, at all events, it is clear from what Dr. Strack says—and I might quote also Delitzsch and Dillmann—that it is much too soon to assume that the school of whose conquests Mrs. Ward boasts is supreme. But, even supposing it were, what has this to do with the admitted and undoubted failures on the other side, in the field of New Testament criticism? If it be the fact, as Mrs. Ward does not deny, that not only Strauss's but Baur's theories and conclusions are now rejected; if it has been proved that Baur was entirely wrong in supposing the greater part of the New Testament books were late productions, written with a controversial purpose, what is the use of appealing to the alleged success of the German critics in another field? If Baur is confuted, he is confuted, and there is an end of his theories; though he may have been useful, as rash theorizers have often been, in stimulating investigation. In the same valuable hand-book of Dr. Zöckler's, already quoted, I find, under the "History of the Science of Introduction to the New Testament," the heading (page 15, vol. i., part 2), "Result of the controversy and end of the Tübingen school."

The Tübingen school (the writer concludes, p. 20) could not but fall as soon as its assumptions were recognized and given up. As Hilgenfeld confesses, "it went to an unjustifiable length, and inflicted too deep wounds on the Christian faith. . . .

No enduring results in matters of substance have been produced by it."

Such is the judgment of an authoritative German hand-book on the writer to whom, in Merriman's opinion, "we owe all that we really *know* at the present moment about the New Testament," as though the Christian thought and life of eighteen hundred years had produced no knowledge on that subject!

In fact, Mrs. Ward's comparison seems to me to point in exactly the opposite direction:

I say to myself (says her spokesman, p. 466) it has taken some thirty years for German critical science to conquer English opinion in the matter of the Old Testament. . . . How much longer will it take before we feel the victory of the same science . . . with regard to the history of Christian origins?

Remembering that the main movement of New Testament criticism in Germany dates not thirty, but more than fifty years back, and that thirty years ago Baur's school enjoyed the same applause in Germany as that of Wellhausen does now, does it not seem more in conformity with experience and with probability to anticipate that, as the Germans themselves, with longer experience, find they have been too hasty in following Baur, so with an equally long experience they may find they have been similarly too hasty in accepting Wellhausen? The fever of revolutionary criticism on the New Testament was at its height after thirty years, and the science has subsided into comparative health after twenty more. The fever of the revolutionary criticism of the Old Testament is now at its height, but the parallel suggests a similar return to a more sober and common-sense state of mind. The most famous name, in short, of German New Testament criticism is now associated with exploded theories; and we are asked to shut our eyes to this undoubted fact because Mrs. Ward prophesies a different fate for the name now most famous in Old Testament criticism. I prefer the evidence of established fact to that of romantic prophecy.

But these observations suggest another consideration, which has a very important bearing on that general disparagement of English theology and theologians which Prof. Huxley expresses so offensively, and which Mrs. Ward encourages. She and Prof. Huxley talk as if German theology were all rationalistic and English theology alone conservative. Prof. Huxley invites his readers to study in Mrs. Ward's article

the results of critical investigation as it is carried out among those theologians who are men of science and not mere counsel for creeds ;

and he appeals to

the works of scholars and theologians of the highest repute in the only two countries, Holland and Germany, in which, at the present time, professors of theology are to be found, whose tenure of their posts does not depend upon the results to which their inquiries lead them.

Well, passing over the insult to theologians in all other countries, what is the consequence of this freedom in Germany itself ? Is it seen that all learned and distinguished theologians in that country are of the opinions of Prof. Huxley and Mrs. Ward ? The quotations I have given will serve to illustrate the fact that the exact contrary is the case. If any one wants vigorous, learned, and satisfactory answers to Prof. Huxley and Mrs. Ward, Germany is the best place to which he can go for them. The professors and theologians of Germany who adhere substantially to the old Christian faith are at least as numerous, as distinguished, as learned, as laborious, as those who adhere to sceptical opinions. What is, by general consent, the most valuable and comprehensive work on Christian theology and church history which the last two generations of German divines have produced ? Herzog's "Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche," of which the second edition, in eighteen large volumes, was completed about a year ago. But it is edited and written in harmony with the general belief of Protestant Christians. Who have done the chief exegetical work of the last two generations ? On the rationalistic side, though not exclusively so, is the "Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch," in which, however, at the present time, Dillmann represents an opposition to the view of Wellhausen respecting the Pentateuch ; but on the other side we have Meyer on the New Testament—almost the standard work on the subject—Keil and Delitzsch on the Old Testament—and a great part of the New, Lange's immense "Bibelwerk," and the valuable "Kurzgefasster Kommentar" on the whole Scripture, including the Apocrypha, now in course of publication under the editorship of Profs. Strack and Zöckler. The Germans have more time for theoretical investigations than English theologians, who generally have a great deal of practical work to do ; and German professors, in their numerous universities, in great measure live by them. But it was by German theologians that Baur was refuted ; it is by German Hebraists like Strack that Wellhausen and

Kuenen are now being best resisted. When Prof. Huxley and Mrs. Ward would leave an impression that, because German theological chairs are not shackled by articles like our own, therefore the best German thought and criticism is on the rationalistic side, they are conveying an entirely prejudiced representation of the facts. The effect of the German system is to make everything an open question ; as though there were no such thing as a settled system of the spiritual universe, and no established facts in Christian history ; and thus to enable any man of great ability with a sceptical turn to unsettle a generation and leave the edifice of belief to be built up again. But the edifice is built up again, and Germans take as large a part in rebuilding it as in undermining it. Because Prof. Huxley and Mrs. Ward can quote great German names on one side, let it not be forgotten that just as able German names can be quoted on the other side. Take, for instance, Harnack, to whom Mrs. Ward appeals, and whose "History of Dogmas" Prof. Huxley quotes. Harnack himself, in reviewing the history of his science, pays an honorable tribute to the late eminent divine, Thomasius, whose "History of Dogmas" has just been republished after his death, and who wrote in the devotest spirit of the Lutheran communion. Of course, Harnack regards his point of view as narrow and unsatisfactory ; but he adds that, "equally great are the valuable qualities of this work in particular, in regard of its exemplarily clear exposition, its eminent learning, and the author's living comprehension of religious problems." A man who studies the history of Christian theology in Harnack without reference to Thomasius will do no justice to his subject.

But, says Mrs. Ward, there is no real historical apprehension in the orthodox writers, whether of Germany or England, and the whole problem is one of "historical translation." Every statement, every apparent miracle, everything different from daily experience, must be translated into the language of that experience, or else we have not got real history. But this, it will be observed, under an ingenious disguise, is only the old method of assuming that nothing really miraculous can have happened, and that therefore everything which seems supernatural must be explained away into the natural. In other words, it is once more begging the whole question at issue. Mrs. Ward accuses orthodox writers of this fallacy ; but it is really her own. Merriman is represented as saying that he learned from his Oxford teachers that

it was imperatively right to endeavor to disentangle miracle from history, the marvellous from the real, in a document of the fourth, or third, or second century; . . . but the contents of the New Testament, however marvellous and however apparently akin to what surrounds them on either side, were to be treated from an entirely different point of view. In the one case there must be a desire on the part of the historian to discover the historical under the miraculous, . . . in the other case there must be a desire, a strong "affection," on the part of the theologian, toward proving the miraculous to be historical.

Mrs. Ward has entirely mistaken the point of view of Christian science. Certainly if any occurrence anywhere can be explained by natural causes, there is a strong presumption that it ought to be so explained; for, though a natural effect may be due in a given case to supernatural action, it is a fixed rule of philosophizing, according to Newton, that we should not assume unknown causes when known ones suffice. But the whole case of the Christian reasoner is that the records of the New Testament defy any attempt to explain them by natural causes. The German critics Hase, Strauss, Baur, Hausrath, Keim, all have made the attempt, and each, in the opinion of the others, and finally of Pfeiderer, has offered an insufficient solution of the problem. The case of the Christian is not that the evidence ought not to be explained naturally and translated into every-day experience, but that it cannot be. But it is Mrs. Ward who assumes beforehand that simply because the "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," by that learned scholar and able writer, Dr. Edersheim, whose recent loss is so much to be deplored, does not "translate" all the Gospel narratives into natural occurrences, therefore it is essentially bad history. The story has been the same throughout. The whole German critical school, from the venerable Karl Hase—and, much as I differ from his conclusions, I cannot mention without a tribute of respect and gratitude the name of that great scholar, the veteran of all these controversies, whose "Leben Jesu," published several years before Strauss was heard of, is still, perhaps, the most valuable book of reference on the subject—all, from that eminent man downward, have, by their own repeated confession, started from the assumption that the miraculous is impossible, and that the Gospels must, by some device or other, be so interpreted as to explain it away. "Affection" there is and ought to be in orthodox writers for venerable, profound, and consoling beliefs; but they start from no such invincible prejudice, and they are pledged by their principles to

accept whatever interpretation may be really most consonant with the facts.

I have only one word to say, finally, in reply to Prof. Huxley. I am very glad to hear that he has always advocated the reading of the Bible and the diffusion of its study among the people; but I must say that he goes to work in a very strange way in order to promote this result. If he could succeed in persuading people that the Gospels are untrustworthy collections of legends, made by unknown authors, that St. Paul's epistles were the writings of "a strange man," who had no sound capacity for judging of evidence, or, with Mrs. Ward's friends, that the Pentateuch is a late forgery of Jewish scribes, I do not think the people at large would be likely to follow his well-meant exhortations. But I venture to remind him that the English Church has anticipated his anxiety in this matter. Three hundred years ago, by one of the greatest strokes of real government ever exhibited, the public reading of the whole Bible was imposed upon Englishmen; and by the public reading of the lessons on Sunday alone, the chief portions of the Bible, from first to last, have become stamped upon the minds of English-speaking people in a degree in which, as the Germans themselves acknowledge,* they are far behind us. He has too much reason for his lament over the melancholy spectacle presented by the intestine quarrels of churchmen over matters of mere ceremonial. But when he argues from this that the clergy of our day "can have but little sympathy with the old evangelical doctrine of the 'open Bible,'" he might have remembered that our own generation of English divines has, by the labor of years, endeavored at all events, whether successfully or not, to place the most correct version possible of the Holy Scriptures in the hands of the English people. I agree with him most cordially in seeing in the wide diffusion and the unprejudiced study of that sacred volume the best security for "true religion and sound learning." It is in the open Bible of England, in the general familiarity of all classes of Englishmen and Englishwomen with it that the chief obstacle has been found to the spread of the fantastic critical theories by which he is fascinated; and, instead of Englishmen translating the Bible into the language of their natural experiences, it will in the future, as in the past, translate them and their experiences into a higher and a supernatural region.

* See the preface to Riehm's "Handwörterbuch."

VII.

AN EXPLANATION TO PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY W. C. MAGEE, BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

IN the February number of this review Prof. Huxley put into the mouth of Mr. Frederic Harrison the following sentence: "In his [the agnostic's] place, as a sort of navy leveling the ground and cleansing it of such poor stuff as Christianity, he is a useful creature who deserves patting on the back—on condition that he does not venture beyond his last." The construction which I put upon these words—and of which I still think them quite capable—was that the professor meant to represent Mr. Harrison and himself as agreed upon the proper work of the agnostic, and as differing only as to whether he might or might not "venture beyond" that. On this supposition, my inference that he had called Christianity "sorry," or, as I ought to have said, "poor stuff" (the terms are, of course, equivalent), would have been perfectly correct.

On re-reading the sentence in question, however, in connection with its context, I see that it may more correctly be regarded as altogether ironical; and this from the professor's implied denial in his last article of the correctness of my version, I conclude that he intended it to be. I accordingly at once withdraw my statement, and express my regret for having made it. May I plead, however, as some excuse for my mistake, that this picture of himself when engaged in his agnostic labors is so wonderfully accurate and life-like that I might almost be pardoned for taking for a portrait what was only meant for a caricature, or for supposing that he had expressed in so many words the contempt which displays itself in so many of his utterances respecting the Christian faith?

Nevertheless I gladly admit that the particular expression I had ascribed to him is not to be reckoned among the already too numerous illustrations of what I had described as his "readiness to say unpleasant," and—after reading his last article—I must add, offensive "things."

With this explanation and apology I take my leave of the professor and of our small personal dispute—small, indeed, beside the infinitely graver and greater issues raised in his reply to the unanswered arguments of Dr. Wace.

I do not care to distract the attention of

the public from these to a fencing-match with foils between Prof. Huxley and myself. In sight of Gethsemane and Calvary such a fencing-match seems to me out of place.

VIII.

THE VALUE OF WITNESS TO THE MIRACULOUS.

BY PROFESSOR THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

CHARLES, or more properly, Karl, King of the Franks, consecrated Roman emperor in St. Peter's, on Christmas day, A.D. 800, and known to posterity as the Great (chiefly by his agglutinative Gallicized denomination of Charlemagne), was a man great in all ways, physically and mentally. Within a couple of centuries after his death Charlemagne became the center of innumerable legends; and the myth-making process does not seem to have been sensibly interfered with by the existence of sober and truthful histories of the emperor and of the times which immediately preceded and followed his reign, by a contemporary writer who occupied a high and confidential position in his court, and in that of his successor. This was one Eginhard, or Einhard, who appears to have been born about A.D. 770, and spent his youth at the court, being educated along with Charles's sons. There is excellent contemporary testimony not only to Eginhard's existence, but to his abilities, and to the place which he occupied in the circle of the intimate friends of the great ruler whose life he subsequently wrote. In fact, there is as good evidence of Eginhard's existence, of his official position, and of his being the author of the chief works attributed to him, as can reasonably be expected in the case of a man who lived more than a thousand years ago, and was neither a great king nor a great warrior. These works are—1. "The Life of the Emperor Karl." 2. "The Annals of the Franks." 3. "Letters." 4. "The History of the Translation of the Blessed Martyrs of Christ, SS. Marcellinus and Petrus."

It is to the last, as one of the most singular and interesting records of the period during which the Roman world passed into that of the middle ages, that I wish to direct attention.* It was written in the ninth

(To be continued.)

* My citations are made from Teulet's "Einhardi omnia que extant opera," Paris, 1840-1843, which contains a biography of the author, a history of the text, with translations into French, and many valuable annotations.

GOODLY WORDS.

Readings from the Mystics, selected by C. H. A. BJORRE-GAARD, of the Astor Library.

Inward or spiritual prayer is an approach of the soul to God, in the name of Jesus, and an abiding in his presence.

In order properly to understand this approach, and put it into practice, it is especially necessary, as an irreversible basis of the whole matter, that through grace we possess, cherish, and exercise a deep impression of the immediate proximity of the presence of God.

God is essentially present with us, in a manner which is incomprehensible to us. He fills heaven and earth; in him we live, and move, and have our being. He is also near our most secret thoughts, inclinations, desires, and intentions: all our inmost soul lies open in his presence. But God as a Spirit, is more especially near to our spirit, and to the most secret recesses of the heart. This spirit of ours does not belong to this world, nor to temporal objects; it was created for God alone, and is therefore capable of enjoying true fellowship with him. . . . This lovely and adorable Being, is not only present with us as God, but also as *our* God in Christ Jesus. . . .

Those who are really drawn by Him, can not rest satisfied with a general dedication of themselves. They perceive that something noble, entire, and complete is required of them: their soul and heart tell them, that he desires to have them solely and wholly for himself.

Happy is the soul, that recognizes within her, this divine and holy call, and surrenders herself to it, childlike, and unconditionally!

If we pay due attention to this latent inclination, and continue inwardly collected, removing every obstacle out of the way of the Spirit, by the exercise of self-denial, and follow this impulse, this principle, like an impelling power, leads, by love, the soul to God. The exercise of inward prayer, is the abiding by this fundamental inclination.

Letters and writings of GERHARD TERSTEEGEN.
Transl. by S. Jackson. London, 1832.

Mental prayer is the lifting up of our heart to God, accompanied with an actual or virtual request for something we desire. It is an *actual* request, when we clothe our thought or desire with unspoken words, mentally forming such sentences as these, or others like them: "O Lord, grant me this grace, for Thy Name's Sake;" or, "My God, my Refuge, Thou Strength of my heart, help me speedily, lest I fall." It is a *virtual* request, when we lift up our heart to God to gain some grace, showing Him our need without moulding our thoughts into words or sentences.

We should strive to form the habit of praying in this way, for it is a weapon of more value and assistance than I can say, and one which we may lay hold of at all times and on all occasions.

LAURENCE SCUPOLI, *The Spiritual Combat.* Transl. by W. H. Hutchings. Oxford, 1881.

What a man receives does not come out of order or by change; neither comes it from hand to hand, nor from person to person. Moreover, no man receives anything but what he earns; and he has earned all he receives, whether it be good or seemingly bad. The law by which a man receives what he does receive is the same as the law by which the Earth receives light and moisture, or by which the firmament receives its suns and planets. Will you give close attention to a statement of this Law? It is liable to escape your notice, because of its sim-

plicity. What you think, that you receive. Thus is the Law stated. By His Thought has God created the whole universe. By His Thought does the Earth bring forth its fruits. By your thought do you receive your rewards. The process of a watchmaker making a watch for himself illustrates the Law. The watchmaker is the skill or knowledge he manifests; the watch is the product of his thought. You receive according to your thought, be it health or ill-health, riches or poverty, freedom or bondage. This is the only method by which all Law—and all Law is one Law—is expressed or becomes manifest. What, then, is your prayer? Whatever you think. What, then, is the answer to it? Whatever you receive. Whatever you ask, you receive. But your petition is not the petition of only a few minutes, or of a special time. Your petition is all your thoughts, day and night, year after year. It is according to these that you receive whatever you do receive. You must pray without ceasing; there is no such possibility as ceasing to think. This, however, you may do; you may so order your thoughts as to receive the happiness you seek; you may, when you will, change the current of all your thoughts, for they are entirely under your own control. No one ever can or ever will make you think other than you yourself will to think. Only things or appearances are affected by thought; you can never be affected, since you are the thinker. Your body, your circumstances, your affairs can be affected by your own thoughts, but not by any one's else. Remember this, and that you are solely responsible for all that happens to your own belongings; another is solely responsible for their accidents. If, then, you think the thoughts that another would have you think, you alone are responsible. Than this there is no other influence; and it is entirely under your control. If you be occupied in selfish pursuits, in material things, your prayers are selfish and material. If you be occupied in the interests of all men, in spiritual things, your prayers are universal and spiritual. You cannot hide the meditations of your heart, my friend; whatever they are they shall be seen in your home, in your business, in your appearance. If any one judge you by your accidents, by your acts of injustice, by your sicknesses, he will judge you wrongly; but he will divine your thoughts rightly. Thought must out; nothing can be hidden.

Pray by perceiving justice, and you will do the will of God. Pray by perceiving charity, and you will love your neighbor as yourself. Pray thus without ceasing.

Day by Day the Essential Bread. By FREDERICK. San Francisco, 1889.

The Holy One Spoke: Those who worship me, placing their hearts on me with constant devotion, and gifted with the highest faith, are considered by me as the most devoted. . . . Dispose thy heart toward me only, to me attach thy thoughts, and without doubt thou wilt dwell within me on high after this life. But if thou art not able to compose thy thoughts immovably on me, strive then to reach me by assiduous devotion. If thou art not capable even of assiduity, be intent on the performance of actions for me. Thou wilt attain beatitude even if thou only performest actions for my sake. If thou art unable to do even this, though filled with devotion to me, then abandon the consideration of the fruit of every action, being self-restrained. . . . Final emancipation results immediately from such abandonment.

THE BHAGAVAD-GITA. Transl. by J. C. Thomson. Hertford, 1855.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS: THE GREEK TEXT, WITH NOTES AND ESSAYS. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1890. 8vo, pp. 504, \$4.

Since the lamented death of Bishop Lightfoot, we suppose that the Regius Professor of Divinity at King's College, Cambridge, who has been chosen to succeed him, would be generally accredited as the foremost British scholar in Biblical Greek. His life has been spent in the study of the text and its meaning, and many of the results are before the world. Every work from his pen—and the number is not small—bears witness to the extent and accuracy of his learning, the acuteness of his perceptions, and the judicial equipoise of his mind in determining difficult questions. Besides, he has the indispensable prerequisite of sympathy with the book or the subject he undertakes to treat. His tone is always reverent, not to say devout, and he is pre-eminently a Christian scholar. Six years ago appeared his work on the Epistles of John, which was welcomed by all students as a most thorough and satisfactory exposition of writings which, though unstudied and artless in style, have a very profound significance. The present volume is constructed after the same pattern. After a luminous introduction we have the Greek text accompanied by comments, with additional notes or essays (Dr. Westcott does not use the imported word *excursus*) at the end of each chapter on points requiring more elaborate treatment.

The Introduction treats skilfully all the points usually taken up in advance, and adds to them an instructive comparison of the Epistle with the Epistle of Barnabas. The vexed question of the authorship is discussed without adding anything new. Dr. Westcott opposes the Pauline authorship, saying justly that the differences in style between this and the acknowledged writings of the great Apostle "characterize two men, and not only two moods or two discussions." He is satisfied with this negative conclusion, and offers no conjecture as to the author. He thinks highly of the Epistle as containing what is found nowhere else in the New Testament, that which may be called "a philosophy of religion, of worship, of priesthood, centred in the Person of Christ." Indeed, the whole section entitled "Characteristics" is profound and searching as to the relations between Judaism and the New Economy. As to division, he makes the

theme to be the Finality of Christianity (i. 1-4), under which comes I. The superiority of the Son to angels (i. 5-ii. 18); II. Moses, Joshua, Jesus, the Founders of the Old Economy and the New (iii., iv.); III. The High-priesthood of Christ, universal and sovereign (v.-vii.); the Fulfilment of Christ's Priestly Work (viii.-x. 18); the Appropriation and Vital Application of the Truth laid down (x. 19-xii.); the last chapter is a personal Epilogue.

The difficult question of the quotations from the Old Testament in the first two chapters is fairly and satisfactorily handled in the notes and in an appended Essay. The Old Testament not only contains prophecies, but is itself one vast prophecy. Prophetic words are not limited by the historical fact with which they are connected, yet the history is not set aside. Nor are the words mere isolated phrases, but represent ruling ideas. When first used they had a perfect meaning, which is at once the germ and the vehicle of the later and fuller meaning (p. 69). The author disclaims as foreign to the context the notion that the eternal generation of the Son is suggested in the words, "To-day I have begotten thee," in this agreeing with Calvin, who calls it "a subtlety." An acute essay on the divine names shows that *Jesus* turns our thoughts to the Saviour's human nature; *Christ*, to his work as Fulfiller of the old dispensation; *Son*, to his divine nature; *Lord*, to his sovereignty over the church. Among the essays following the second chapter is one on the singular reading of verse 9, *apart from God*, instead of *by the grace of God*, and a satisfactory note on the idea of "bringing to perfection" as applied to Christ and to believers. Another (p. 111) furnishes a scholarly treatment of certain hypothetical sentences. Chapter V. gives occasion to some useful thoughts on the idea of priesthood (*præ-Christian*), the priesthood of the Nations and that of the covenant People.

In the sixth chapter occurs the famous *crux* about the impossibility of renewing those that were once enlightened. The author shows that the language is hypothetical, yet thinks that the case is one that must be taken into account as possible. If the gospel has been received and afterward rejected, there can be no second spiritual birth. "The powers entrusted to the Christian society are inadequate to deal with this last result of sin; but the power of God is not limited." But on this view it is not easy to see the force of the writer's reasoning. To say that it is impossible for man to renew spiritual life means that it is possible for him to impart

it in the first instance, which we hardly think that Dr. Westcott holds. The illustration from nature (verses 7, 8) indicates an absolute impossibility. The land fruitful only for ill is rejected. It is nigh unto a curse. Its end is to be burned. It is utterly desolate, as if destroyed by volcanic forces. For it there is no recovery.

The many perplexing questions in the ninth chapter are cleverly dealt with, but we cannot agree with the learned author in rendering *diathikē* covenant all the way through.* How is it possible that the death of the victim can be called "the death of him that made the covenant"? There are difficulties however one renders the word, but they are far greater on Dr. Westcott's rendering than on that of the common version and the revised. The long note on Sacrifice (pp. 281-292) is very comprehensive and lucid. Another interesting note (p. 384) treats of the social imagery in the Epistle, the political terms applied to the Christian Society. In xii. 1 he admits "the cloud of witnesses" to mean witness-bearers, and that there is no evidence that the word (*martur*) ever means a spectator, and then, strangely enough, says it is impossible to exclude the thought of the spectators in the amphitheatre. We submit that if the writer had intended spectators he would have used the appropriate word. "The place of repentance," which is spoken of in verse 17, is explained to be in Esau himself, and not, as some have supposed, in his father Isaac, a view which the author says is equally against the language and the argument. "No place of repentance" means no possibility of undoing his own past act so that its consequences would cease. The Revised Version expresses this by putting the clause in a parenthesis. The additional notes to the last chapter treat of the history of the Septuagint word for altar (*thusiastērion*) from the beginning to the time of Chrysostom, and furnish a list of all the doxologies in the Epistles and the Apocalypse. An appendix to the volume discusses the use of the Old Testament in the Epistle, in which the author in his usual scholarly way states at length the range of the quotations, the method of citation, and the text as compared with the Septuagint, and then proceeds to the interpretation, which is sound and satisfying and very suggestive. The gist may be given in this sentence: "The quotations are not brought forward to prove anything, but to indicate

the correspondences which exist between the several stages of the fulfilment of the Divine purpose from age to age."

The volume is an important addition to the literature of the Epistle. We have seen a criticism which denies this, saying, "The volume cannot be called a great exegesis." But it certainly goes to the bottom of every question it touches, and furnishes more material for ascertaining "the mind of the Spirit" than any other book on the subject. It would be of small use to a lazy man who wants to have everything cut and dried ready to his hand, but to an intelligent student who desires only to have the requisite aid for forming his own judgment it must be of the greatest service. It combines the careful study and grammatical analysis of the text with a large and enlightened view of the scope of the writer and the place of his work in the progress of revelation. There is little or no reference to modern critics, although Dr. Westcott, like a faithful son of the Church of England, pays respect to patristic authorities and cites some (*e.g.*, Primasius) whose names are not often met with. But his citations always have something besides the reputation of the author to recommend them. He thinks that study will be concentrated on the Old Testament in the coming generation; and that this book is an essential part of our Christian Bible, he says "we know now with an assurance that cannot be shaken." Some of the problems concerning its constituent parts may prove insoluble, but careful and reverent study will open up new views of the scope of divine revelation, and render each attainment a starting-point for something still higher and better.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

NEW YORK.

LUX MUNDI. A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation. Edited by CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of Pusey House. London: John Murray; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889. 8vo, pp. xxiii., 525, cloth, \$5.60.

This book consists of twelve Essays contributed almost wholly by Christian scholars who represent the theology of Pusey and Keble. They may, in fact, be regarded as an attempt to rationalize that theology; to present it in such a form to thoughtful men that, while it still remains inevitably mysterious, it shall satisfy their reason, their intellect, their conscience, better than any alternative that has yet been seriously offered to them. The writers are, of course, independent; each has his own style; beyond

* It is to be observed that the learned Dr. Hatch is of the same opinion. His short paragraph on the meaning of *testamentum* is well worth consideration. See his *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 42.

the limits of this volume their opinions might more or less widely diverge. But for the substantial teaching of these Essays they are mutually responsible. The editor concludes the *Preface* with the words: "We do desire this volume to be the expression of a common mind and a common hope." As to the title, it may be presumed that "the Religion of the Incarnation" means a religion of which the Incarnation, as defined or described in Scripture and by the Catholic theologians, is an accepted datum or postulate.

Regarding this book, then, as Apologetic, the Essays, even if they were, as literary compositions, of equal excellence, could scarcely be of equal argumentative importance. *The Problem of Pain*, for instance, has been treated far more adequately by Dr. Martineau, in his *Study of Religion*, than in the delightful and really valuable essay by Mr. Illingworth. And inasmuch as *The Religion of the Incarnation* follows Theism in the order of Logic and Thought, a satisfactory contribution to the solution of the Problem of Pain which does not depend upon the Incarnation will be so much the more effective. Again, among these Essays themselves some are of primary and some of secondary importance. Thus *The Christian Doctrine of God* (Rev. Aubrey Moore) is primary in relation to *The Atonement* (Hon. and Rev. Arthur Lyttleton); while both of these are logically subordinate to *The Holy Spirit and Inspiration* (Rev. C. Gore.) The doctrine of the Atonement has been constructed by theologians who regarded the Levitical system of rites and sacrifices as formed by Moses himself, under the direct guidance or dictation of Almighty God, and for the purpose of serving as exact types and anticipations of the details and significance of the life and death of Jesus Christ. The elaborate criticism, during the last quarter of a century, of the Old Testament has certainly greatly modified the judgment of thoughtful men; and if—as is conceivable—it should turn out that what was once considered a divinely appointed type revealed by God to Moses was really introduced after the Exile for a perfectly different purpose, any doctrine of the Atonement presented apologetically to thoughtful men must take account of that new discovery.

Speaking generally, these Essays, though quite as liberal as they are conservative, written in an admirable spirit, going very far toward the perfect accomplishment of their purpose in many directions, yet seem, when they are most successful in satisfying the reason, to do this by *sacrificing* the doc-

trines which they are intended to support. Thus Canon Holland's Essay on *Faith* is wholly incompatible with the necessity either of dogmatic orthodoxy or the actual reception of the Sacraments. Canon Paget's most suggestive Essay on *Sacraments* will probably be regarded with suspicion both by Augustinians and by Protestants, whose prejudice about their number finds as little justification in reason as in antiquity. There is, moreover, scarcely a single essay which does not logically involve the actual ultimate salvation of every human being.

Again, speaking of the Essays generally, while exceedingly subtle, for the most part lucid, and thoroughly fair and candid, they fail in many important and even essential particulars to realize (and therefore to consider and answer) what the real and most serious difficulties of thoughtful persons, who examine reverently and with no unwillingness to believe the Catholic Creed, actually are. Mr. Gore, in his Essay on *The Holy Spirit and Inspiration*—perhaps the most valuable essay in the series—comes very near the recognition of the *exact* difficulty which prevents even subtle metaphysicians from accepting the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. That exact difficulty is, that it includes the *Personality of the Holy Ghost*. If Mr. Gore's essay had been a mere statement of what is orthodox or of what is true, it would have been an almost faultless production; but it is an *apology*, an attempt to convince thoughtful men that no alternative doctrine (including its contradictory) has ever been offered as to the nature of God which more completely satisfies the reason than that doctrine of the Trinity which includes the doctrine of the *Personality of the Holy Ghost*. Many objections would be made by competent scholars to Mr. Gore's exegesis of passages of Scripture. They would affirm, for instance, that he often mistakes rhetoric or poetry for dogma; that he ascribes creation to the Holy Ghost as a Person in a way wholly incompatible with the teaching of St. Paul and St. John as to the creation of the world through the Word—whom both those apostles identify in the clearest way with that divine being who became Incarnate, the *Son of God*. But the special weakness of Mr. Gore's essay is, that while he shows that the human reason cannot help admitting the necessity to thought of precisely such a distinction in the divine nature as corresponds to the theological doctrine of God and the Word, the Father and the Son, he entirely fails to show or to indicate that it is possible to show, that the human reason has ever, in anything like the

same way or degree, recognized the necessity to thought of a third *Personality* corresponding to the Holy Ghost of theology. To multitudes of thinkers the doctrine of the Logos is welcome as a satisfaction to the reason; to nearly everybody the doctrine of the Personality of the Holy Ghost is extraneous to philosophical Theism, and is accepted solely on the compulsion, so to speak, of the Catholic exegesis of a limited number of texts of Scripture.

The place where Mr. Gore seems to realize the exact difficulty of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is in a note at the foot of pp. 336-337. "St. Augustine speaks of [the Holy Spirit] as the Love of the Father and the Son: 'Vides Trinitatem si caritatem vides. Ecce tria sunt: amans et quod amatur et amor.' And this Love is itself personal and co-ordinate: 'commune aliquid est Patris et Filii; ut ipsa communio consubstantialis et coeterna.' But in such speculation [the Fathers] allow themselves with much reserve and expression of unwillingness. In fact, it is easy to see that an eternally living God, knowing and loving" (we may add even self-conscious), "must be a God whose Being involves eternal relationships. Knowledge involves a relation of subject and object" (but not necessarily the *personality* of the object known); "to make love possible there must be a lover and a loved" (and this does, in the case supposed, involve the personality of the loved). "It is more difficult to see how a perfect relationship must be threefold; but there are true lines of thought which lead up to this, such, for instance, as make us see first in the family the type of complete life. Love which is only a relation of two is selfish or unsatisfied; it demands an object and a product of mutual love."

It is much to be regretted that Mr. Gore did not deal more fully with this—by far the most difficult—part of his subject. Was the love of "Adam" and "Eve" *selfish* before the birth of Cain? And is it orthodox to call the Holy Ghost "*the product of the mutual love*" of the Father and the Son?

However, the space allowed for this notice of a really valuable book is exhausted. It will be a surprise almost equally to the Catholic and the Evangelical Party in the Anglican Church.

WILLIAM KIRKUS.

BALTIMORE.

IMAGO CHRISTI: THE EXAMPLE OF JESUS CHRIST. By Rev. JAMES STALKER, M.A. Introduction by WILLIAM M. TAYLOR,

D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Pp. 332, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

The religious world is ever ready to welcome a rising man in Biblical and Theological literature. An original and sound thinker is one of God's greatest gifts to any generation. What each successive period needs is the coming of men who can give fresh inspiration to commonly accepted and familiar truths, that thus these truths may not lose their grasp of the public mind, but continue to control popular thought and feeling. Such a man we have in the Rev. James Stalker, M.A., of Glasgow, a comparatively young minister of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland. He had already approved himself as a very efficient pastor, an eloquent and instructive preacher, a skilful parliamentarian, and a wise organizer before he became known as an author. His first published volume was a "Life of Jesus Christ," of small proportions, and modestly termed a hand-book. Then followed his "Life of St. Paul," of equally unpretentious size. These treatises so strongly commended themselves by their excellence that all who had read them were prepared warmly to receive his latest offering—*Imago Christi: The Example of Jesus Christ*.

This volume, larger in size and more expanded in treatment, fully sustains the promise of its predecessors, and the dawning reputation of the author. It is really a profound and charmingly simple study in the life of Jesus. Like many of the best things, it grew unexpectedly to what it is. We are told that in applied chemistry it is not uncommon, from the refuse of substances hitherto thrown away in the manufacture of certain staple articles, to make additional articles which for beauty, utility, and even moneyed value quite equal the original articles. The author tells us in his Preface that he was working on a subject which he meant to denominate the Mind and Teaching of Christ; but he says: "As I went on my progress was impeded by the fact that, especially in the department of ethics, Jesus seemed to teach as much by His example as by His words. . . . But as I wrote it grew and grew, till almost unawares, the plan of the new book shaped itself in my mind."

As indicated, *Imago Christi* deals mostly with the practical or human side of Christ's life, and presents the great Exemplar in the relations in which He touches all mankind. It must be allowed that everything in the conduct of a religious teacher, and especial-

ly of such a religious teacher as Jesus of Nazareth, is of incalculable importance to His followers. It is equally true that discipleship attaches itself to a person rather than to a doctrine, not to a person to the exclusion of doctrine, but to doctrine as embodied and illustrated in a person. It is not abstract truth which the soul yearns for so much as for souls who, penetrated and possessed by truth, breathe and live it, and thus bring the truth in feeling and action to the heart. A question of undying moment to the earnest enquirer is, How did Jesus act in this or that given condition? The question is strikingly answered in this volume.

A glance at the table of contents must suffice. Take these as samples: Christ in the Home; Christ in the State; Christ as a Friend; Christ as a Preacher; Christ as a Controversialist; Christ as a Man of Feeling, and one must be impressed with the richness of the discussions. Passages from any one of them might be quoted which are full of the essence of the Gospel, and marked by the purest literary taste. Speaking of Christ's taking with Him certain of His disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration and into the scene of His last agony in the garden, he says: "These scenes incite our wonder that any should have been admitted so far into his secret life. Were not these hours of prayer especially too sacred for any mortal eyes to see? That His friends were admitted to them proves that it is a prerogative of friendship to be admitted into the secrets of religious experience. It is a truncated and most imperfect friendship when the gateway of this region is closed; for it means that one friend is excluded from the most important province of the other's life. Hence it may be affirmed that friendship in the highest sense can exist only between Christians; and even they only taste the bloom on this cup when they have arrived at the stage of free and frequent converse on these themes which were native to the mouth of Christ" (p. 104, 105).

In the chapter on controversy, he closes with this: "To prove to men that they are outside the kingdom is an easy thing in comparison; but it may be far better to let them see that they are only a few steps from its threshold. The triumph of a ruthless polemic may gratify the natural heart; but far more like the Master, where it is possible, is a winning irenicum."

As a work adapted to stir the heart in its private devotions, and to supply suggestive themes for the pulpit and the social prayer-

meeting, it has few, if any, superiors among the books of our times.

HENRY B. RIDGAWAY.

EVANSTON, ILL.

THE PERMANENT ELEMENTS OF RELIGION.

By W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Ripon. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1890. Crown 8vo, pp. 487, \$2.

Bishop Carpenter has availed himself of the results of the comparative study of religion to a remarkable degree in his Bampton Lectures, which for this reason introduce into Christian apologetics a new and important feature. He seeks the permanent elements of religion not in an outside revelation, but in the personal condition, common to all men, on which all religious life depends. Given man as he is, with his nature, his sense of dependence, his desire for fellowship and the necessity of his thought to be looking forward, he finds the elements of spiritual conviction in all religions, but in different and varying degrees. The Oriental religions are mainly the beliefs which have contended for supremacy with Christianity in the world, and when these are tested by the conditions here laid down they do not express all that is demanded. Islamism recognizes the dependence of man upon God, but it does not show how the human can have any fellowship with the divine, and the element of progress has no place in it. Again, Buddhism recognizes the fellowship of man with God in some of its earliest features, and the necessity of progress in connection with the advance of life, but it fails to satisfy our sense of dependence upon a superior being. Again, Positivism recognizes our sense of fellowship and yet denies the demand for progress and gives no satisfaction to the feeling of dependence. On the other hand, Christianity fulfils all three of these conditions. It satisfies the sense of dependence; it gives us fellowship with God through Jesus Christ, and it holds out a boundless future to the human race. In still another point of view, the permanence of religion is to be traced in the simple conditions of human existence. The laws of spiritual life are permanent and must be satisfied because they belong to the higher part of our nature. They are four in number: the law of environment, the law of organization, the law of sacrifice, and the law of indirectness. These laws are structural. We are influenced by our surroundings, and we are also so constructed that our organic life asserts itself against our environment. Again, we find that the gains in life are in proportion to the pain which we undergo,

the self-sacrifice which we enter into. Again, the law of indirectness, or that a man cannot perfect himself in anything if he seeks perfection directly, opens out a large field, which can only be understood in connection with a life that is not completed in this world.

These are the fundamental ideas which Bishop Carpenter introduces into his lectures. He constructs upon a solid foundation the basis on which religion and morals unite, and he finds that in the recognition of personality, in the demand that religion must be based upon a person, and in the fact that personality is as real when applied to God as it is when applied to man, the fundamental starting-point by which we reach out on the lines of our common faculties for the permanent things in religion which Christianity abundantly supplies. It will be seen from this brief statement that Bishop Carpenter's lectures are thoroughly constructed. They present the whole of religion in a new light. Men are not asked to satisfy themselves of the authenticity of a divine revelation, but they find that the revelation called Christianity meets them on the threshold of the demands of their human consciousness and experience. They start not so much from assumptions as from the facts of existence, and they advance to that point where they see in Christianity, as compared with other religious faiths, the fulfilment of the wants of the higher nature in man, as they are not met by any other religious systems. This volume is a complete answer to the agnosticism of the day. It is a more thorough refutation of the agnostic positions than has been made by any other writer. Bishop Carpenter meets such men on their own grounds and compels an assent which could never be given if the old-fashioned method of establishing the credentials of Christianity were resorted to. The special distinction of this work is that it gives us a new method of approach to the Christian religion, and that it is written in such a popular style and with so little of the affectation of learning that it will go into the hands of any fairly educated person with the certainty that its position will be understood and that it is likely to produce conviction. We have needed such a treatise, and it has long been evident to the readers of apologetic works that only by employing a better method in handling them could the religious difficulties of persons troubled with modern doubts be removed. Bishop Carpenter has not gone aside from his task, and yet he introduces into these lectures abundant evidence that he has not neglected the

learning which his subject demands, and that he has within his reach all the resources which belong to the trained scholar and the man of culture. We have not met for a long time with a volume of the Bampton Lectures which is better adapted for the widest reading, or that is likely to reach to better advantage the people of to-day who stand hesitatingly on the threshold of religious belief.

JULIUS H. WARD

BROOKLINE, MASS.

THE ONE GOSPEL; OR, THE COMBINATION OF THE NARRATIVES OF THE FOUR EVANGELISTS, IN ONE COMPLETE RECORD. Edited by ARTHUR T. PIERSON. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 740 and 742 Broadway [1890]. 12mo. pp. vi., 203, flexible cloth, red edges, 75 cents; limp morocco, full gilt, \$2.

This is another of the now comparatively numerous combinations of the four gospels into a single narrative. I am acquainted with twenty of them. The text is that of the Authorized Version, and there are no notes or other helps by way of explanation or correction. The conversations and quotations in the Gospels are printed within inverted commas, the latter, if poetical, in lines. The text is divided into paragraphs and sections, which are not those of the Authorized or Revised Version. There is a good index of topics, but no table showing whence the several sections are derived. Unusual boldness is exercised in combining the different texts. The result is satisfactory, on the whole. I notice that the words in John's Gospel, "Arise, let us go hence," are left to stand as they are there given, and hence come right in the middle of our Lord's discourse. I should have supposed that, since Dr. Pierson does not hesitate to alter the arrangement in John's prologue, he would have transposed them to the close of the so-called high priestly prayer, where they seem to be more in place, as introducing the account of our Lord's leaving the upper room. In common with most modern commentators, he does not believe that Judas participated in the Lord's Supper, although present up to the time of its institution. In general he follows Robinson, but not slavishly. The order of events in the Gospels is by no means always clear, nor is it generally an important matter, and no two scholars agree on all points.

The production of books like that under notice is to be commended as leading to a closer and wider acquaintance with the narrative of our Lord's life. The best biogra-

phy of
by the
puts
struck
produ
Som
combi
vised
would
rior a
it is i
so in
Dr. I
in a
of th
the r
text-
stand
14,
"sle
terat
text
It
lead
the
will
face

A
or,
& C
A
teet
A
cat
Ess
I
I
Be
Le
en
39

Pr
in
w

k
g
d
P

1

phy of our Lord is, after all, that furnished by the original biographers, and when one puts their compositions together one is struck by the ease with which they blend to produce a single impression.

Some may regret that Dr. Pierson did not combine the Gospels in the text of the Revised Version. But if he had done so, he would have lessened his audience. Superior as the Revised Version is in accuracy, it is inferior in readability, and immeasurably so in popularity. It is, however, a pity that Dr. Pierson did not introduce here or there in a note or bracket in the text the reading of the Revised Version, for that would help the reader to a clearer understanding of the text—e.g., pp. 39, 52, 53, 61, r. "lamp . . . stand" for "candle . . . candlestick;" p. 14, r. "slew all the male children," for "slew all the children." By these slight alterations a flood of light is thrown upon the text, and many misunderstandings removed.

It is a great privilege to be the means of leading people to acquaint themselves with the Gospel story. I trust Dr. Pierson's book will have a wide sale, and bring many face to face with the Son of God.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.
NEW YORK.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Abbot, Francis Ellingwood. *The Way out of Agnosticism; or, the Philosophy of Free Religion.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Anderson, J. *English Intercourse with Siam in the Seventeenth Century.* London, 1890. Pp. 510, 8vo., 15s.

Aquinatle, Thomas D. *doctoris angelici et scholarm catholiarum patroni, monita et preces. Jam tertio ed. Th. Esser.* Paderborn: Schöningh. Pp. 90, 16mo, 90 pf.

Baker, J. F. R. *The Sternness of Christ's Teaching and its Relation to the Law of Forgiveness.* Cambridge, 1890. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Becker, Joh. *Kurfürst Johann von Sachsen und seine Beziehungen zu Luther, 1530-1538. Inaugural-Dissertation.* Leipzig: Gräfe, 1890. Pp. 82, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Bonnefoy, M. *La Religion future d'accord avec la science, la raison et la justice.* Paris: Fischbacher, 1890. Pp. 398, 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Bournand, F. *Le Clergé sous la troisième république.* Paris: Libr. Savine, 1890. Pp. 421, 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Braasch, Aug. Heinr. *Alt-katholicismus und Romanismus in Oesterreich. Reiseergebnisse.* Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg. Pp. iv., 60, gr. 8vo, 60 pf.

Bratke, Ed., Prof. *Wegweiser zur Quellen- und Literaturkunde der Kirchengeschichte. Eine Anleitung zur planmässigen Auffindung der literarischen und monumentalen Quellen der Kirchengeschichte und ihrer Bearbeitungen.* Gotha: Perthes. Pp. vi., 232, 8vo, 6 mk.

Brown, J. B. *The Risen Christ, the King of Men.* Popular ed. London: Unwin. Pp. 360, post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Butcher, C. H. *Sermons Preached in the East.* London: Stock. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Butler, W. J. *Ignorance the Danger of the Church: a Sermon Preached in the Church of St. Mary the Great, Cambridge, on the Second Sunday in Advent, 1889, to the University Church Society.* London: Rivingtons. Pp. 20, 8vo, sewed, 6d.

Catholic Churches, Convents and Institutions of Cincinnati. Cincinnati: Burghelm. Pp. 196, 8vo, cloth, \$1.

Cole, W. R. *Some Thoughts on Baptism.* London: Simpkin. Pp. 132, post 8vo, 2s.

Conway, James, Rev. *The Respective Rights and Duties of Family, State and Church in Respect to Education.* 3d ed. New York: Fustet. 16mo, paper, 25 cts.

Cornelius, C. A. *Die Rückkehr Calvins nach Genf; II. Die Artichau; III. Die Berufung.* (aus "Abhandlungen der kaiserlich-bayerisch. Akademie der Wissenschaften"). München: Franz, 1889. Pp. 102, 4to, 3 mk. (I.-III.), 4.60 mk.

Crofton, H. W. *Christian Secularism: a Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's, Fulham, on November 17, 1889, for the Christian Evidence Society.* London: Rivingtons. Pp. 24, 8vo, sewed, 1s.

Dixon, Thomas, Rev. *Living Problems in Religion and Social Science.* New York: Dillingham. Pp. 253, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Driver, S. R., D.D. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. With an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions and Fac-similes of Inscriptions.* New York: Macmillan. 8vo, cloth, \$3.50.

Dwenger, Jos., D.D. *The Spanish Inquisition.* New York: Benziger. 16mo, paper, 20 cts., net.

Erdmann, J. C., Prof. Dr. *Ernste Spiele. Vorträge, theils neu, theils längst vergessene.* 4. Auflage. Gesamtausgabe seiner jemals gehaltenen populären Vorträge. Berlin: Hertz. Pp. vii., 322, 8vo, 4 mk.; gebunden, 5 mk.

Ewald, Paul, Prof. *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage und der Weg zu seiner Lösung. Eine akademische Vorlesung nebst Exkursen.* Leipzig: Hinrichs. Pp. xiii., 257, 8vo, 6.80 mk.

Farrar, F. W. *The Gospel according to St. Luke. With Map, Introduction and Notes.* (Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools.) New York: Macmillan. Pp. 158, 18mo, 1s.

Forbes, J. *The Servant of the Lord in Isaiah xl.-lxvi. reclaimed to Isaiah as the Author, from Argument, Structure and Date.* Hamilton (Edinburgh: Clark). Pp. 270, post 8vo, 5s.

Friese, Philip C. *Semitic Philosophy: showing the Ultimate Social and Scientific Outcome of Original Christianity.* Chicago: Griggs. Pp. 247, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Frommel, Emil. *Zum Gedächtniss ihrer Maj. der entschlafenen Kaiserin und Königin Augusta. Rede, gehalten im Augusta-Hospital bei der Abendfeier am 13. Jan. 1890.* Berlin: Mittler. Pp. 11, 8vo, 40 pf.

Fuller, M. *Our Title Deeds: a Defence to the Church against Misdoment. Being a Reply to Mr. Mill's book; "Title Deeds of the Church of England to her Endowments."* London: Griffith. Pp. 400, post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Grundemann, D. R. *Die Entwicklung der evangelischen Mission im letzten Jahrzehnt. [1878-1888]. Ein Beitrag zur Missionsgeschichte, zugleich als Ergänzungsband zur zweiten Auflage der "Kleinen Missionsbibliothek."* Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing. Pp. xi., 300, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Hartel, Wilh. v., Dr. *Patristische Studien. I. Zu Tertullian, De spectaculis, de idololatria (aus "Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlich. Akademie der Wissenschaften").* Wien: Tempisky in Commission. Pp. 58, lex. 8vo, 1 mk.

Hartmann, Ph. *Repertorium Rituum. Uebersichtliche Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten Ritualvorschriften für die priesterlichen Functionen. Neubearbeitet und vervollständigt von—. 6. Auflage.* Paderborn: Schöningh. Pp. xx., 863, lex. 8vo, 10 mk.

Rome and Foreign Mission Preaching: Short Practical Sermons . . . by Revs. H. G. Dickson, W. W. D. Firth, A. Brinkman, and others. London: Skeffington. Pp. 106, post 8vo, 3s.

Horning, Wilh. *Urkundliches über die Kirche Jung-Sanct-Peter in Strassburg. Festschrift, zur 600 jährli. Feier der Grundsteinlegung dieser Kirche herausgegeben.* Strassburg: Vomhoff. Pp. viii., 61, 2 Thl., 8vo, 2 mk.

Jundt, A. *Rulman Merwin et l'ami de Dien de l'Oberland.* Paris: Fischbacher, 1890. Pp. 157, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Kingsley, Charles. *Charles Kingsley, his Letters, and Memories of his Life.* Ed. by his Wife. New York: Macmillan. 12mo, portrait, cloth, \$1.75.

Koenigsberger, Bernh. *Die Quellen der Halachah. (I. Der Midrasch. II. Mischnah und Tosephtha.) Unter Benutzung handschriftlichen Materials bearbeitet. I. Thl. Der Midrasch.* Berlin: Engel. Pp. iii., 131, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Kolde, Th. *Luther's Selbstmord. Eine Geschichtselge P. Majunkes, beleuchtet.* Leipzig: Deichert. Pp. 42, 8vo, 60 pf.

Korallus, J. P., Dr. Fremde Götter im Tempel Michas. Nachgewiesen. Königsberg i. Pr.: Ksch. Pp. 29, 8vo, 1 mk.

Kurtz, J. H., Prof. Church History. Authorized translation from latest revised edition. By Rev. John MacPherson. 3 vols. Vol. 3. London: Hodder. Pp. 530, post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Laidlaw, J. The Miracles of our Lord: Expository and Homiletic. London: Hodder. Pp. 378, post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Liddon, H. P., D.D. Sermons. Second Series. New York: Whittaker. Pp. 188, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Littlehales, H. Pages in Fac-simile from a Layman's Prayer Book in English, about 1400 A.D.: containing Medieval Versions of the Lord's Prayer, Te Deum, Magnificat, etc. Edited from the original in the British Museum, ms. 27,502. London: Rivingtons. Pp. 24, 4to, 3s. 6d.

Momerie, Alfred Williams, Prof., LL.D., etc. Church and Creed. Sermons preached in the chapel of the Foundling Hospital. 2d ed., 1890. London: Blackwood. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. New York: Whittaker, \$1.50.

Palgrave, Reginald F. D., C.B. Oliver Cromwell, the Protector. An appreciation based on contemporary evidence. London: Low, Marston & Co., 1890. Demy 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

Passion Play at Ober-Ammergau. With the whole Drama translated into English, and the Songs of the Chorus in German and English. By the author of "Charles Lowder." London: Allen. Pp. 132, 4to, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

Perrenoud, H. Étude historique sur le progrès du protestantisme en France, 1802-1888. Paris: Libr. Fischbacher, 1889. Pp. 253, 8vo, 5 fr.

Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, 1550, to which are appended some occasional forms of prayer issued in her reign: the whole printed from originals in the British Museum and other public libraries, with an historical introduction. (Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature.) London: Griffith. Pp. 258, post 8vo, 1s.

Pulpit Commentary—Revelation. Introduction by Rev. T. Rendell; Exposition, Rev. A. Plummer, assisted by Rev. T. Rendell and A. T. Bot; Homilies, Rev. S. Conway, Rev. R. Green and Rev. D. Thomas. London: Paul. Pp. 606, 8vo, 15s.

Riehm, Ed. Alttestamentliche Theologie. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von K. Pahneke. Halle: Strien, 1889-90. Pp. 440, 8vo, 8.50 mk.

Rivett, A. W. L. Ten Years' Church Work in Natal. With an Introduction by Very Rev. E. M. Goulburn. London: Jarrold. Pp. 338, post 8vo, 6s.

Rooper, W. L. Hymns for Elementary Schools, Original and Selected. The music edited by Duncan Hume. London: Griffith. 4to, 2s. 6d.

Ryan, A. St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland. London: Trübner (Dublin: Gill). Pp. 72, post 8vo, 2s.

Ryan, A. Sermons, 1877-1887. London: Simpkin (Dublin: Gill). Pp. 338, post 8vo, 5s.

Sadler, M. F. The Epistles of St. Paul to the Colossians, Thessalonians and Timothy: with Notes, Critical and Practical. London: Bell. Pp. 340, post 8vo, 6s.

Schenck, F. S., Rev. The Ten Commandments in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Pp. 130, 12mo, bds., \$1.

Scott, Archibald, D.D. Buddhism and Christianity: a Parallel and a Contrast. Being the Croall Lectures for 1889-90. Edinburgh: Douglass (London: Simpkin). 1 vol., demy, 7s. 6d.

Shaw, W. F. Manual for Catechising. With Stories and Illustrations. London: Griffith. Pp. 238, post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Sloman, Arthur, Rev. The Gospel according to St. Matthew, being the Greek Text as revised by Drs. Westcott and Hort. With Introduction and Notes. New York: Macmillan. 16mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Somerville, A. N. Precious Seed Sown in Many Lands: Sermons, with Biographical Sketch. London: Hodder. Pp. 322, post 8vo, 5s.

Spurgeon, C. H. The Salt Cellars. Second Series. New York: Armstrong. Pp. 367, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Stephenson, H. M. Christ the Life of Men. The Hulsean Lectures for 1888. Cambridge Warehouse. Pp. 54, post 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Westcott, B. F. From Strength to Strength. Three Sermons in Stages of a Consecrated Life. London: Macmillan. Post 8vo, 2s.

Whitfield, F. "He whom God Remembers." Addresses on the Book of the Prophet Zechariah. London: Niebet. Pp. 334, post 8vo, 5s.

Wright, Arthur, Rev. The Composition of the Four Gospels. New York: Macmillan. 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

Ziegler, Theob. Stittliches Sein und stittliches Werden. Grundlinien eines Systems der Ethik. Strassburg: Trübner. Pp. vii, 151, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

NOTES AND MAGAZINES.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT PERIODICALS.

THEOLOGISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT AUS DER SCHWEIZ. VII. 2 (1890).

I. Die textkritischen Grundsätze von Westcott und Hort bei ihrer Ausgabe des griechischen Neuen Testaments. Uebersetzt von Arnold Rieger. II. Zwei Vorlesungen über die hebräische Poesie, Dr. Victor Rysel. III. Die Composition der Bergpredigt, Matt. v.-vii. (Schluss), A. Frikart. IV. Bücherschau.

REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DES RELIGIONS. (Jean Réville.) XXI., 1. Jan.-Fév., 1890.

I. Le livre de la Genèse, par Ch. Piepenbring. II. Études védiques—Traduction d'un Hymne à l'Aurore (Rig-Veda, I., 123), par Paul Regnaud. III. Revue des livres. IV. Chronique. V. Dépouillement des Périodiques. VI. Bibliographie.

THEOLOGISCHE QUARTALSCHRIFT. 73, 1 (1890).

I. Schanz, Der sakramentale Charakter der Ehe. II. Ehrig, Der Schriftbegriff von Pfarre. III. Voglmann, Lateinische Hymnen, Antiphonen, etc., aus der ehemaligen Kollegiatkirche, bezw. dem früheren Benediktinerkloster zu Ellwangen. IV. Rezensionen. V. Analecten.

OUR magazines study the wants and the tastes of a large class. SO SCHUBNER'S for May appeals to the lover of art, the man who has put his money into some building and loan association, the theatre-goer, the student of Napoleonic history, the politician, and the reader of fiction. In Mr. T. H. Bartlett's article on Millet a curious anecdote is related of Diaz, which showed that he hated above all things talk on art, and if such was attempted in his presence he endeavored to stop it. Failing that, he left the room in disgust. Mr. W. A. Linn thinks that Building and Loan Associations provide a safe and profitable way of investing money. In these respects they are better than savings-banks. The Japanese Consul-General in Singapore, Mr. T. J. Nakagawa, describes the revolving stage used in Japanese theatres. The idea seems a good one. Mr. Clarence Denning was happy enough to find in the ms. diary of Mr. William Brisbane, of South Carolina, some striking portraits of the first Napoleon as he appeared in 1804. Mr. Francis Lynde Stetson handles an ever timely topic, "The Rights of the Citizen as User of the Public Streets." It is refreshing to know that he has any rights; the next thing is to find some way of maintaining them. The story of Sweden Creek settlement in Minnesota is in fresh fields. The illustrations are up to the standard.

IN HARPER'S for last month there was an interesting article on Thomas Young, M.D., F.R.S., "the most learned, profound, variously accomplished scholar of science who has appeared in our age, perhaps in any age." Yet he has fallen into almost total obscurity. The author, the famous blind Methodist preacher, William Henry Milburn, does his part in rescuing his name from entire forgetfulness. He relates, in a pleasing way, Dr. Young's signal services. One of these was first to make out the hieroglyphics by a study of the Rosetta stone. By so doing he opened a new world to science. He antedated Champollion by fully five years, yet the French scholar worked independently, and has obtained the credit of the discovery. Dr. Young died at the age of fifty-six, but had done so much work that his death could not properly be said to have been premature.

"THE PRESENT DAY PAPER" in last month's CENTURY is by Professor Richard T. Ely, with the title "A Programme for Labor Reform." It contains some striking things. For instance, it calls attention to the increase in Sunday work, which it justly characterizes as a rapidly growing evil, against which workmen all over the land are crying out, and their complaint is becoming bitter as they find that it is unheeded. The classes mentioned by Professor Ely as most involved at present are barbers, bakers, trainmen, photographers' assistants, and telegraph operators. Professor Ely cites the curious fact that the effort of the Journeymen Bakers' National Union to rouse the clergy of New York and Brooklyn was a failure. Professor Ely also calls attention to the notorious weakness of States and cities, as manifested in the inability of the latter to compel the horse-car companies to lay properly grooved rails.